Imprimatur,

Febr. 23. 1676. H. London.

Imprimatur,

Febr. 23. 1676. H. London.

2.

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon a Late

PAMPHLET

Entituled THE

Naked Truth;

Or, THE

TRUE STATE

OF THE

PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,

Printed by *T. R.* and are to be sold by *Benj. Tooke* at the *Ship* in St. *Paul's Church-yard*, 1676.

UMI

UMI

ANIMADVERSIONS
ON THE
TITLE,
THE
DEDICATION,
AND
Epiſtle to the READER.

OF all the Rarities which of late have been the diſcourſe of the Town (where men *ſpend* much of *their time*, as the *men of Athens* did, *either in hearing or telling ſome New thing*) nothing has been more talkt of, than a cerrain Pamphlet call'd *The NAKED TRUTH.* Now having got a ſight of it, and ſcann'd it throughout, I am abundantly ſatisfied, not only from his Style, which is ſometimes Enthuſiaſtick, but from his Matter and Principles (if he ſtick to any) that the Author is a Borderer upon Fanaticiſm and does not know it. But by *Naked Truth*

Truth he ſeems to mean Chriſtianity without either Welt or Guard (as they ſay) and not ſet off with Ceremony. For his Title-page ſtands thus: *The Naked Truth, or the True State of the Primitive Church.* This Title-page of his, he explains very ſufficiently, p. 17. *In the Primitive times* (ſaies he) *in the greateſt Storms, when the whole World of* Jews *and* Gentiles *were Enemies to the Church, and not one of your Ceremonies in the Church to preſerve it; The ſimple Naked Truth without any Surplice to cover it), without any Eccleſiaſtical Policy to maintain it overcame all: and ſo would do now, did we truſt to that, and the Defender of it.* If he means its great Defender in Heaven, we put our whole Truſt in him: or if he means his Vice-gerent upon Earth, the Defender of the Faith, we repoſe an intire Confidence (as we ought) in the gracious Declarations and Expreſſions His Majeſty is pleaſed to repeat upon all Occaſions, of his perpetual good Affection and Compaſſion for the Church of *England.* Or if by *Truſting to the ſimple Naked Truth*, this Author means, *the Truth of our own Cauſe*, we dare truſt to that, and to many Defenders of that too, But if truſting to the *Naked Truth*, be to this *Pamphlet* and this *Project*; we dare not truſt to it. Why, this is ſtripping the Church bare to the very skin, nay, Skin and all muſt go, an Article of a Creed if need be, for he ſpends his firſt long Chapter in Reforming there too, and reducing the *Faith* to, I know not what, *Naked Truth.* Methinks he ſhould have call'd his Pamphlet *The TRUTH FLEY'D*, for *NAKED TRUTH* is too ſhort, and not ſpoken through his Subject. But *Skin for skin, and all that a man has will he give for his life*: for This he contends on his Principle of *Self-preſervation*, This he concludes the only poſſible expedient to keep out *Popery*, This is his *healing Salve*, This is the product of his *Faſts*, the Anſwer to his *Prayers*, the effect of his *ſeeking God* (as he takes care to acquaint us) This has been the Travel of his mind, *ſince he had theſe thoughts*, which he has been *humbly conceiving theſe two years*, time enough for an Elephant to bring forth in.

This

This is the thing which he Dedicates *to the Right Honourable, the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament.* Pity it was not presented to the Lords during the last Session, then I believe, it would have been delivered over by their Lordships, to be confuted by the same experienc'd hand, that took to task a more Primitive piece of *Naked Truth*, viz. *the Solemn League and Covenant* in the Palace-yard at *Westminster*, where it expired into ashes. As for those Noble Patriots in the House of Commons, 'tis probable they would have voted him their Thanks too after the same manner, for laying a Libel at their doors, making a breach upon their glorious *Act of Uniformity*, and violating their *Act* (their most necessary Act) *against Printing without a License:* though he makes a neat Excuse whilst he is doing it, that he does it against his Conscience, for which he very pœntiently *begs pardon of God and Them*, and so sins on: for, all this while he goes on with his Printing and Publishing it without a License.

How he will justifie his claim to the Title of *An Humble Moderator*, I cannot imagine; unless Assuming, Imposing, and turning all upside down, be the signs of *Humility*; and immoderate Zeal for one Party to be the qualification of a *Reconciler*, or *Moderator*.

In his Address to the Reader he gives an Account, why he is so scrupulously careful to conceal his Name: *because he cannot bear reproach.* So all that is like to fall upon the poor Fatherless and Motherless Pamphlet; though he would have done a piece of Justice, to have named himself, and so to have cleared others, for it has been confidently laid to the charge of more than one Reverend person who (I have great reason to believe, and am several waies assured) had no manner of hand in it, yet he does himself and me a particular favour, in making it impossible for me to reflect upon his Person (which I know no more than the Man in the Moon) only as he makes himself the Patron of so vile a Cause. For whosoever vents his own Amusements, to the Churches great and real prejudice (and that's this case) he must not think to scape for the

Godliness

Godlineſs of his Style, nor for a man of good Intentions, as ſure he is, or elſe he would never give the Devil ſo much more than his due, as to make ſo ſtrange a Proteſtation as he does here, that *he would never condemn any good Action though done by the Devil* (as if he ſuppoſed, the Devil might do ſome ſuch for ought he knows) but Hell it ſelf, they ſay (though we never heard before of any good Actions there, yet it) is full of Such as were once full of good *Intentions.*

Animad-

Animadverſions upon his firſt Chapter concerning Articles of Faith.

I Confeſs when firſt I ſaw this Jewel of a Pamphlet, and had run over two or three pages of this Chapter, I ſuſpected its Author for ſome Youngſter that had been dabling among the *Socinian* Writers, and was ambitious of ſhewing us his Half-Talent in the way. I was quickly delivered from this jealouſie by his Orthodox contradictory expreſſions in other places: But I find he is one of the *Men of the Second Rate* (as I take leave to ſtyle them) that hardly ever ſee to the Second Conſequence. Therefore once for all I proteſt, that I do not charge Him with many of his own moſt obvious Conſequences as his opinions: for 'tis plain he does not diſcern them. But the Church may juſtly complain of him, for thruſting out ſuch crude, indigeſted matter, without communicating theſe conceptions of his, to ſome that would have ſhew'd him the weak and blind-ſides of them. Now ſince the miſchief is done, to undo the Charm again it becomes a duty to Expoſe him; and moſt of all for this Chapter, where he has moſt expos'd himſelf: a Chapter of moſt pernicious conſequence, and admirably ſerving the turn of the rankeſt Sectaries. Who not being able to keep up their Congregations any longer, or to keep their Diſciples from ours by trivially declaiming againſt our Ceremonies; They ferment them now by inſtilling into them new fears and jealouſies of our Doctrines: Warning them away from our Churches, as if there was ſome ſtrange Fury working, or ſome Innovations contriving in the Church of *England*: and as if we were allowed to preach and maintain even in our City-Pulpits, new Articles of Faith, *Socinian* or *Pelagian*, in oppoſition to the Catholick and truly Primitive. How unſufferably *J. O.* for one has reflected, not only upon ſome particular Perſons, but upon the whole Church of *England* and its Governers upon this account, any one may read, that does but run over his *Survey of a diſcourſe concerning Eccleſiaſtical Polity*. No wonder

then, if now they are transported with joy, when an Author appears as one dropt down from heaven to *plead* their Cause, vouching himself a Son of the Church of *England*, *teaching as one having Authority* like a Father, venturing at first dash upon the tenderest Point in the World, *concerning Articles of Faith*, implying and supposing all along, that some are extremely to blame for *improving the Faith*, not by *confirming*, but *enlarging* it, asking, whether *the state of Salvation* be *alter'd*? and, *what need any other Articles?* In what Church does he ask these Questions? and how monstrous impertinent are they here, if we do nothing like it?

Well! to begin with him, and follow him step by step through his many turnings and windings, and sometimes nothing but a rope of Sand to guide me; He makes a discovery to us in the first place, that *That which we commonly call the Apostles Creed, is the sum of Christian Faith.* And again, that *the Primitive Church received this as the sum total of Faith necessary to salvation. Why not now?* I answer, it is so now, and all true Sons of our Church hold it so now: Then why this Question? Why that which follows? *Is the state of Salvation alter'd?* No doubt the terms of Belief, on which Salvation is ordinarily attainable, are never changeable, but, like God himself who establisht them, fixt and immoveable. But still he follows his blow, though he fights with the Air: *If it be compleat* (saies he) *what need any other Articles?* There may have been needful heretofore, not only other Articles, but other Creeds, for the farther explication of those Articles in the Apostles Creed: and yet in those new Creeds, not one new Article. The *Apostles Creed* is *the sum of Christian Faith.* True; yet I hope he will not think the *Nicene*, the *Constantinopolitan*, and the *Athanasian* Creeds were superfluous and unnecessary: And in his Chapter about *preaching* he seems concerned for this last the *Athanasian*; and yet his censure is so bold upon *Constantine the Emperour, and some godly Bishops* (he conceives more zealous than discreet, and so do some godly Bishops conceive of this Author) and his pique at *the new word Homoousios* carries such an ugly reflection upon that Creed, that I scarce dare understand him. But we shall have more of this hereafter.

He would have men improve in Faith, but *rather Intensivè*, than

than Extenſive, to Confirm it rather than Enlarge it. And yet 'tis certain that all formal and mortal Hereticks, that are not Atheiſts, are juſtly condemn'd for want of due *extenſion* in their Faith.

He *prays* us to *remember the Treaſurer to* Candace *Queen of* Æthiopia, *whom* Philip *inſtructed in the Faith: His time of Catechizing was very ſhort, and ſoon proceeded to Baptiſm.* This is ſoon pronounc'd (as he uſes to do) but not prov'd. It does not appear how long, or how ſhort was the time of his Catechizing: or how many Leagues they travelled together before *they proceeded to Baptiſm.* 'Tis true there needs no great length of time to propoſe and demonſtrate *Chriſtianity* (as St. *Peter* and the Apoſtles did it in few words, and) eſpecially out of the Propheſies of the Old Teſtament, which the *Eunuch* was then reading. But then a great deal muſt and may be learnt in a little time: as the prime Articles of Faith are ſo ſtrongly and rationally knit together, that 'tis indeed impoſſible to teach or learn any one of them, without teaching or learning them all. Whereas then our Author proceeds thus, *But* Philip *firſt required a confeſſion of his Faith, and the Eunuch made it, and I beſeech you obſerve it: I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God: and ſtraightway he was baptized. How? no more than this? no more.* What! nothing of the Holy Ghoſt till he heard of him in the Baptiſmal form? What does he mean then by that which immediately follows? *This little grain of Faith being found, believed with all his heart, purchaſed the kingdom of Heaven. Had he believed the whole Goſpel with half his heart, it had been of leſs value in the ſight of God. 'Tis not the quantity, but the quality of our Faith, God requireth.* I anſwer, the true and full notion of Saving Faith is embracing from the whole heart the whole Fundamental truth of the Goſpel. Why does he talk then of the *whole Heart*, and yet ſuppoſes but half or a part of this Fundamental truth? Does he dream that St. *Philip* the Evangeliſt Chriſten'd the *Eunuch* after Chriſt's Aſcenſion into Heaven, only as St. *John* the Baptiſt brought men to his Baptiſm, before Chriſt appeared in his Miniſtry upon earth? and made him ſuch a Diſciple, as thoſe whom St. *Paul* found in *Epheſus*, that had not ſo much as *heard whether there were any Holy Ghoſt?* to whom thereupon St. *Paul* proved Chriſtianity from their Ma-

ſter the *Baptiſt*'s Teſtimony: and to make them perfect Chriſtians, which they were not before, but only a ſort of Diſciples, *Baptized them in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*, Acts 19.

Yet this Author will not let go his hold, and will needs be thus objecting againſt himſelf. *But, ſure the Eunuch was more fully inſtructed. It may be you are ſure of it: but I could never yet meet with any aſſurance of it, nor any great probability of it.* Yes, I am ſure of it, if he means by *more fully inſtructed*, taught other Fundamental Articles beſide this one, *that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* And I will give him one *demonſtration* of what I ſay (which is more than a Probability) out of the ſtory it ſelf; and he might have met with this *demonſtration* in it himſelf, if he could have ſeen but an inch before him; for we find in the ſtory that the *Eunuch* himſelf made the motion to the Evangeliſt, and reminded him of baptizing him. Therefore 'tis evident they had diſcourſt before even of this particular, though we are told no more in expreſs words, but that St. *Philip preacht to him Jeſus*, the Faith of *Jeſus*. Yet he had brancht out this *Faith* into all its Fundamental Articles, and had declar'd to him even the neceſſity of *Baptiſm*; which he underſtood not at all, if he did not apprehend it aright, and as it was preſently to be celebrated; *in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.* Why, this very ſhort Baptiſmal form is a *perfect Creed* by itſelf, if it be throughly penetrated and explained in its full latitude: for it ſeems the *Name of the Son* was by a divine Criticiſm choſen and interpos'd between the other two Perſons, whoſe *God-head* was confeſt and acknowledg'd by the *Jewiſh* Church, rather than that of the *Word*, to denote the Second of the 3 Perſons of the moſt equal and inſeparable *Trinity*, as God of God from the Eternal Father; and alſo to connote the Co-eternal Son, made man *in the fulneſs of time*, and therefore *born of a Woman*, the Virgin *Mary*. Why, here's a great part of the *faith* already. And then the Baptiſmal action it ſelf, the Immerſion and Emerſion out of the Water, did, in its full and plain importance (as no doubt the *Eunuch* was made to underſtand it, before he was brought to it) acquaint him and *inſtruct* him abundantly in thoſe other great points of Faith, the *Dying*, *Burying*, and *Riſing again* of Chriſt *for our Juſtification* from our ſins; as alſo with the

whole Practical duty of a *Christian man*: that being the *Inward part, or Thing signified* in the Sacrament of *Baptism: viz.* a *Death unto Sin*, the great comprehensive duty of *Mortification*, and a *New birth unto Righteousness*: where he must needs be told the mystery of the First and Second *Covenant*, that *being by nature born in sin*, Original sin, and *a Son of wrath*, he had hereby *Forgiveness of sins*, was *adopted* and made a *Child of Grace*, and Heir and Co-heir with Christ in *the Communion of Saints*, to live with him after the *Resurrection in life everlasting*. Now this Author may see what use and need there was of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, that put in, *One baptism for the Remission of sins:* Since the true understanding of that Sacrament is so instructive of all other Fundamentals. For, all this our Apostle St. *Paul* supposed, as the common Notions all *Christians* should have of their Baptism, *Know ye not that as many of us as were baptiz'd unto Jesus Christ, were baptiz'd into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father: even so we should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his Death; we shall be also in the likeness of his Resurrection*, Ro. 6. 3, 4, 5, &c.

To as little purpose then is his next Application of that passage in St. *John, Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God.* 1 Joh. 4. 2. Why, the *Mahumetans* confess, in some sense, that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, as a great Prophet sent from God. Will a *Mahumetan*, or a *Socinian* confession of this suffice? For the *Socinians* will admit the *Apostles Creed as the sum of Faith*; the words I mean, but not the Catholick sense of it: And they will say, *through Jesus Christ our Lord* at the end of their *own* Prayers, in their own distorted sense of it. But if *confessing Jesus Christ* be, as St. *John* means it, *confessing* the *God* and the *Man* (otherwise it is not indeed *confessing* the same *Jesus Christ*, whom Christians ought to confess) this takes in whole *Christianity*, that is, all its few primary *Fundamentals* are coucht in this: All these no question, were virtually contain'd in St. *Peter*'s short confession of faith, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*; for which *confession* he was blest, and upon which *faith* Christ declared he would *build his Church as upon a Rock*. And all these no doubt St.

Paul

Paul preach to the *Corinthians*, when yet he *determin'd to know nothing amongst them, but Jesus Christ and him crucified.* 1 Cor 2.2.

But whereas, in the next place, he charges some with introducing *new* and *many Articles of Faith*; I hope he does not mean all our 39 Articles: most of which, as (a late Right Reverend and learned Prælate) Bishop *Lany*, Lord Bishop of *Ely* styles them in one of his 5 Sermon, *p* 48. are *Articles of Peace, and consent in certain Controversies*, not Articles of Faith or Communion. Not as if the Subscribers to these Articles engaged themselves to no more than not to contradict them, or never to preach against them; No, the Church is so just to her self, as to exact for the security of her own *Peace*, that all whom she trusts with teaching others, or whom she recommends to the world with University Degrees, shall subscribe to these Articles as their *own Opinions*, and what they believe as *convinc'd* in their own *Judgments* that they are *true*; Yet this I take to be one of her greatest Ecclesiastical Policies, that she admits the many thousands and hundred thousands, without any Subscription to these Articles, *ad Communionem Laicam*, that is, not to Half-Communion (as some would ignorantly construe it, because they have Sacrilegiously taken away the Cup from the Laity) but to that which the Primitive Church called *the Communion of Laicks*: that is, such a Communion as was given without such Conditions as were anciently requir'd of Ecclesiasticks. But my best excuse for him is, that, though he be scuffling in the dark, yet he strikes at the Papists especially, and would narrow their Faith, rather than ours. 'Tis true they have introduc'd many a new Article of Faith which is bad enough; and, which is worse, many a one that has not a syllable of truth in it. He puts the *Papists*, *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists* all together. *One cries, this is a Demonstration, Another* (saies he) *cries, no such matter*, &c. He may make as bold with any of these as he pleases, for we are none of these; and I am not bound to make war in their vindication.

In the 24*th. page* concerning the *Procession of the Holy Ghost*, he does implicitly condemn the Catholick Church both in the East and West, for being so presumptuous in her Definitions. 'Tis modestly done of him. But he *means, we have no comprehensive know-*

knowledg of the matter declared. His meaning is good and true; But his Inference is ſtark naught, if he *means*, therefore we underſtand not at all that this or that is declared. And I am ſure, I do him no wrong in fixing this meaning upon his words, for theſe are his very words, *If then our Reaſon underſtands not what is declared, how can we by Reaſon make any deduction by way of Argument from that which we underſtand not?* Is it even ſo? Then let us put the caſe with reverence, That Almighty God, who aſſuming, I ſuppoſe, the ſhape of an Angel treated with *Abraham* face to face, as a man does with his friend, ſhould for once have ſpoken in the ſame manner to *Arrius* or *Socinus*, and made this one declaration to either of them, that the Catholick Church's doctrine of the Trinity was true, and his falſe; Then I demand, would not this have been demonſtration enough of the Faith which we call *Catholick*, either to *Socinus* or *Arrius*? And yet all thoſe *contradictory Arguments*, which either of them had *once* fanci'd *Inſoluble*, ſuppoſing them not anſwerd in *particular*, would remain againſt it, and ſtand as they did before any ſuch *declaration*; and yet all this without giving him any *comprehenſive knowledg*.

But as to the ground upon which he raiſes all this duſt, in *p.* 4. about the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*, I can eaſily anſwer for the Church of *England*; let the Church of *Rome* anſwer for her ſelf, if ſhe can, for her trampling upon the poor *Greek* Church as ſhe lies in the duſt, and branding her with Hæreſie for her doctrine of the *Proceſſion*, as cruelly as her *Turkiſh* Maſters burn their Half-moons on the bodies of thoſe whom they enſlave. But our Church is not ſo uncharitable, as to define it a Hæreſie for any to maintain, that the *Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father by the Son*, though we maintain alſo with good reaſon, as a great truth, that the *Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father and the Son*. But this makes no breach of Communion between us and the *Greeks*, the difference ariſing only from the Inadæquation of Languages, which notwithſtanding, we agree in the main of this Article. So that I may anſwer all this needleſs diſcourſe, as *Demoſthenes* once anſwered the Oratour *Æſchines*, who kept much ado about a word which the other had not uſed ſo properly; But *the Fortunes of Greece*, ſaid he, *do not depend upon it*.

But *if in Divine matters we once give way to human deductions*,

a

a cunning Sophiſter may ſoon lead a weak diſputant into many Errors. So I doubt ſome ſuch one has miſled this Author, who, whatever he be, I dare ſay is not condemned by St. *Paul* for one of *the diſputers of this World*, but rather is one of thoſe whom the ſame Apoſtle forbids us *to admit to any doubtful diſputations.* But is this Author ſerious againſt *human deductions* from Scripture, as he calls them, eſpecially ſince he confeſſes, *p.* 7, that *Hæreſies never appear at firſt in their own natural ſhape, but diſguiſed with ſpecious pretences drawn from ſome obſcure places of Scripture, capable of various interpretations; And thus having gotten footing by degrees, they lay aſide their diſguiſes and march bare-fac'd?* Now after this obſervation, would one think it poſſible for one that is but maſter of coherent thoughts for three minutes, within the compaſs of three pages to tell us gravely, *Wherefore we have no other ſafe way to ſpeak of divine matters but in Scripture language*, ipſiſſimus verbis, *with the very ſame words.* Admirable! What way then is there to oppoſe thoſe new ariſing *Hæreſes*, that draw their *ſpecious pretences* from thoſe *obſcure Scriptures*, and do not in expreſs words contradict any plain Texts, if there be no ſafe way to ſpeak againſt them, or to ſpeak at all in Divine matters, but in expreſs words of Scripture? Nay our Author, as it happens, is aware of this horrid conſequence, and admits it: blaming for his imprudence *that moſt prudent and moſt pious Conſtantine* (as he calls him) *the firſt and beſt of Chriſtian Emperours*, that he did not *purſue his own Intentions, to ſuppreſs all Diſputes and all new Queſtions of God the Son, both* Homoouſian *and and* Homoiouſian, *and command all to acquieſce in the very Scripture expreſſions without any addition*, and then he is *confident the* Arrian *Hæreſie had ſoon expir'd.* Why, this was the very deſign of thoſe *Arrians* themſelves, that which they drove at in the Court, that which they urg'd in all their little Councils and Cabals; that *ſilence* might be injoyn'd both Parties, and the *Nicene* profeſſion of Faith not impos'd upon them: as if it had not been ground enough for the Church *ſafely* to declare and define *one* divine Eſſence in the Trinity, when St. *John* had ſet it down, *There be three that bear witneſs in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe three are One*, τὸ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι. What ſignifies Ἓν but *Unum*, that is, *Una Res*, or *Una Eſſentia*, *One Eſſence?* and

and what is ὁμοίωσις more than this? Only the Church had a neceſſity of uſing that word directly to meet and encounter the oppoſite ὁμοιώσις, which the Hereticks took up, to ſpeak their new Faith in a new Term, and beſide and againſt the Scripture.

But this Principle will miſlead him farther yet: for upon his meaſures and rules of Faith, what will become of our *Prime and moſt neceſſary Principles of Faith* (as he very truly calls them *p.* 4.) *the Trinity three Perſons and one God*? Why do we find this Author *p.* 29. ſolemnly *affirming* this *in the preſence of God, that he has known ſome paſs for very good Preachers that could not give a good account of the* Athanaſian *Creed*. I ſuppoſe this Author paſſes for a very good Preacher himſelf, and firmly believes this Creed, and profeſſes his Faith by it openly in the Church: yet what good account can he give of this Creed, if we have *no other ſafe way to ſpeak of divine matters, but in Scripture language*, and may not ſafely uſe deductions or inferences from Scripture? How many Terms are there in the *Athanaſian*, which to ſeek for in the Apoſtles Creed or in the whole Bible, were to as much purpoſe, as it was for the old affected *Ciceronian* in *Eraſmus*, to labor and toil his brains to turn that Creed into *Ciceronian* Latin? Yet theſe are the Terms in which the Catholick Church has thought ſhe *ſpoke ſafely* in theſe *Divine matters*; But it ſeems ſhe has ſpoken all this while at the peril of her underſtanding. In the mean while the old dormant Hereſies may *ſafely* revive again, as the *Monothelites* that affirmed that there was but one Will in Chriſt, and the *Neſtorians* that aſſerted there were two Perſons in Chriſt, *&c.* Now, their Ghoſts may riſe and walk and invade the Church again, under this Authors ſhadow: for though by immediate conſequences they deſtroy the Faith, and rob us of our Saviour; yet theſe conſequences are only *Rational Deductions, an human* (or Heathen) *way of Argumenting*, as he words it. But there's *no ſafe way to ſpeak of theſe Divine matters but in Scripture language*, Ipſiſſimis verbis; *with the very ſame words*: Then theſe and twenty other ſorts of Heretiks are ſafe enough, unleſs they *lay aſide their Diſguiſes* and turn ſuch errant Mooncalves, as to ſtate their Heretical concluſions point blank contradictory to ſome expres propoſitions in the Bible. But any thing to avoid the *plague of School*

Divinity (as he very feelingly calls it) though I dare say, he was never infected with it: But alas! poor St. *Augustine* had a touch of it, and so had *Athanasius* before him. And, if we believe this Author, *Many of the primitive Doctors and Fathers being converted from heathenism, and having by long and great industry acquir'd much knowledg in natural Philosophy, Antiquity, History, and subtle Logick or Sophistry, were very unwilling to abandon quite these their long studied and dearly beloved Sciences (falsly so called) and therefore translated them into Christianity, applying their School-terms, Distinctions, Syllogisms, &c. to Divine matters, intending perchance through indiscreet Zeal to illustrate and imbellish Christian knowledg with such Artificial forms and figures, but rather defaced and spoiled it.* Kindly and learnedly spoken of *Learning* in general, and Reverently spoken of the *Primitive Doctors and Fathers!* Why, he could hardly have declared himself with greater animosity and severity against *Greg. de Valentia*, or *Suarez*, or some other of the late *Popish Schoolmen*. As for the Fathers, that they were no *defacers* or *spoilers* of *Christianity*, 'tis defence enough for them, if I alledge in their behalf the Testimony of One that was none of their greatest Champions, even Mr. *Dallé* himself: who in that very book, which he was so many years collecting and writing on purpose to expose them for all their little failings: yet he confesses and contends, *that they were guilty of no Errors amounting to Hæresies in their Controversies of Faith*. And by this Author's good leave, the Fathers were not the men that corrupted our Christianity through Philosophy; but if any have done so, it is rather that sort of men (the Popish Schoolmen,) who (pardon the expression) *Aristoteliz'd the Fathers*. As for the elder Schoolmen their design was noble, to draw the whole Scheme of Divinity into such order and method, that a Divine might sit and see, as it were, his whole world of Matter before him; and to arm him at all points where he might possibly be attaqu'd, they set themselves to go into the bowels of all Controversies, herein they have often exceeded in beating matters too thin; and I say not, all their Armour was of Proof, but that which is firm and good, as a great deal of it is, ought not to be thrown away because it is too heavy for some mens shoulders. That unlucky *Pantænus* sett up Disputing (if you'l take

take our Author's word for it) in a School of *Alexandria*, though others verily believe that one St. *Paul* before him, *disputed daily for the space of two years in the School of one Tyrannus.* And some differ from this Author's Opinion, that *the damnable Heresie of the* Arrians *sprang from the School of* Pantænus, they rather think, and our Ecclesiastical Historians say, that *Arrius*'s spleen had never wrought so furiously against the Church, but only for a disappointment he received in his aspiring expectations of some great Bishoprick.

But we must needs look back to the second and third pages, to see how he justifies all this, by alledging & proving, with a great deal ado, from Reason and Scripture, that *No man should be forc't to Believe, for No man can be forc'd to Believe.* As for example (says he) *If you hold a clear printed book, with a clear candle, to a man of clear eyes, and able to read; he will certainly read: But if the print be not clear, or the candle, or his sight not clear, or he not learned to read; Can your force make him read? and just so it is with our Understanding, which is the eye of our Soul, and a Demonstration being as a Candle to give light; If then your Demonstration or Deduction, or his Understanding be not clear, or he not Learned; You may with a Club dash out his brains, but never clear them.* It were easie to confound his Similitude, by shewing the disproportion between the parts of it. For he brings the sense of Seeing, which is linkt and ty'd to the dull dimensions of a Body, and the studied acquir'd faculty of Reading, which is the other term on the one side; I say he brings these into comparison with our *Understanding*, which he calls *the Eye of our Soul*; and a *Demonstration*, which he makes *the candle to give it light:* But if it be, as he supposes here, a demonstration indeed about things absolutely necessary for us to know, it must of necessity so irresistibly dart its beams into the mind of any, that is not born without any brains to let them in, as there shall need no *force to clear them.* But 'tis more to my purpose to retort his Similitude thus: Suppose you held a *clear printed book, with a clear candle, to a man of clear eyes*; and suppose the man shuts his eyes, and suppose all men that look upon him attentively, see that he shuts his eyes (as that's a thing may be seen) [or, which is all one, that he stops his ears (as some that will not so much as enter our Church-doors)

refusing to hear the voice of the Charmer, charm he never so wisely] and suppose this book thus held to him be the Word of God it self: Then, since the same Word tells us, that some may be *damn'd for shutting their eyes* upon it; Certainly the Magistrate may, and ought to force him not to wink so hard, but to open his eyes: (and sure all this may be done without *dashing* out his brains with a Club) and then indeed it will follow that *he will certainly read*, but not otherwise. The *Jews* in *Rome* are constrain'd once a week to hear a Christian Sermon: The Pope indeed cannot make the *Jews* Believe, but he can make them hear, unless they close up their Ears with wool, or purposely send their Wits a wool-gathering (as the Country phrase is) which would be a fault in their Wills, to be punish't if it could be prov'd: Whereas this Author would ascribe all to mens want of common Understanding, or want of Discerning ability in the matters now in question, which are the great matters of Faith. But God is wanting to no man in Necessaries: and the Reason which helps every man to see these Truths, at least when they are shew'd and pointed out to him, is a vulgar, a popular thing. But sure this Author imagines there are a world of Idiots, that he may not be forc'd to admit any mans hypocrisie & wilfulness to be gross & palpable. Thus he concludes, Our *force may make him blinder, but never see clearer, may make him an hypocrite, no true Convert*. No! by this Author's favour, he that *shuts his eyes*, yet pretends to see clearly, is an hypocrite already: and we that would oblige him *to open his eyes*, whether he will or no, do not go the way to make him an *Hypocrite*, but a *true Convert* from his sinful Hypocrisie.

But he still eagerly pursues his ill-chosen Principle in mistaken charity: *If* a man *do not see* a thing *clearly contain'd there* (i.e. in Scripture) *you cannot force either his Sight or his Faith*. p. 4. He had said before, p. 3; *He then that believes the Scripture, cannot but believe what you clearly demonstrate from Scripture, if he hath clear brains: if he have not, your force may puzzle and puddle his brains more, by the passion of Anger and Hatred, &c.* And again in the same page, *Can you drive Faith, like a Nail into his head or heart with a hammer? Nay, 'tis not in a mans own power to make himself Believe any thing farther than his Reason shews him; much*

less

leſs Divine things. Put this together (and there's a great deal more of it) and ſee whether it does not lead us into the very dregs of Mr. *Hobbs*'s Divinity; *i. e. Fatality.* For if it be not in any man's power to diſcern Fundamental truths (of which we are treating in this Chapter) when they are laid before his eyes; Then I am ſure it is none of his fault: of which the reſult is this, that whereas our Saviour has pronounc'd, that *He that believes ſhall be ſaved, and he that believes not* (that is, he that disbelieves after a ſufficient propoſal) *ſhall be damned*; This Author will have it, that *He who does not believe*, even after ſuch Evidence, cannot believe, and therefore *cannot be ſaved*, and ſo cannot avoid being damned. Only, this Author is better natur'd indeed than Mr. *Hobbs*, who allows the Civil Magiſtrate to correct, and even to cut off thoſe that are thus neceſſitated to do evil (as men kill Vermin or noxious Creatures:) Whereas this Author (as much in the other extreme) *dares go no farther than that a Chriſtian Magiſtrate ſhould puniſh or baniſh thoſe that trouble the Church of Chriſt with Doctrines apparently contrary to the clear Text, and ſuch as are deſtructive to Chriſtianity.* But who will judge what is *clear?* or what is thus *deſtructive?* the Party accuſed, or the Civil Magiſtrate? For, as for the Eccleſiaſtick, he makes the Church all along in this diſcourſe a party: and we ſhall ſee anon that he will not allow her, even in a General Council, for a competent Judg, to be rely'd upon by both Parties, no not in *points of Faith.* But if he *dares go no farther than this*, I dare not go ſo far: I am very far from thinking, as he does, that it was any part of S. *Pauls* meaning in this place, *I wiſh they were even cut off that trouble you; to wiſh there were a fitting Power, that is a Chriſtian Magiſtrate to puniſh or baniſh them:* and his Reaſon is nothing, why St. *Paul* ſhould *not mean here*, a *cutting off from the Church by way of Excommunication: for that* (ſaies he) was in his *power* to do. Why then ſhould he wiſh it? It might be *in his Power*, i. e. he wanted not authority, but yet he might juſtly apprehend it a perillous thing, formally to *cut off* and *excommunicate* ſo numerous and powerful a Faction, for fear of ſome great *apoſtaſie* from Chriſtianity; from which theſe men, by his favour, had not *cut off* themſelves though they ran into Schiſms or Hæreſies. Therefore he might well

well consider it as a thing rather to be wisht than executed: and if this were no wish of St. *Paul's* making, that the *Troublers of the Church might be punisht or banisht*, then I cannot find in my heart to go along with this Author in making it my wish, that they should either be *banisht* or more severely *punisht* for the present, than by forcing them into our Churches (whence they have indeed banisht themselves) that they may hear our defences of an honest Cause. And if it wring their Consciences to come thither to Prayers, I cannot chuse but make another wish, that they might first be satisfied either in our publick or private Conferences with their Leaders. The notable effect of such Conferences, he that does not believe let him but read what my Lord Bishop of *Winchester*, (then of *Worcester*,) printed, of what pass't, in that short one, at *Worcester-house*, or the *Savoy*, where as soon as ever it came to writing in Syllogism, which this Author so despises here and every where, the adverse Party was driven immediately to that wild Assertion, that *whatsoever may be the occasion of sin to any, must be taken away*. But this Author, without making any such provision for their Souls, as has any thing in it of constraint is for leaving them to their fate. *As for those* (saies he) *who keep their erroneous opinions to themselves*, who neither *publish nor practice any thing to the disturbance of the Church or State* (as if to *set up Altar against Altar*, were no disturbance) but only refuse to conform to the Churches established Doctrine or *Discipline* (*pardon me if I say*) *I cannot find any warrant, or so much as hint from the Gospel to excuse any force to compel them*. No! let all such live like Pagans, and go to no Churches at all, if they have a mind to it.

But he knows full well there is a common Objection about the Magistrates using any compulsion, *taken from* S. Augustine. *Some Hereticks Donatists came to him in his later daies, and gave thanks that the Civil Power was made use of, to restrain them: Confessing, that was the means which brought them to consider more calmly their own former extravagant Opinions, and so brought them home to the true Church.* To this he answers, *First, the Donatists are well known to have been a Sect, not only erroneous in judgment but very turbulent in behaviour, always in seditious practices. & in that case*

(he

(he tells us) *he ſhew'd before how the Civil Magiſtrate may proceed to Puniſhment. But*, he ſays, *our caſe is not in repreſſing ſeditious practices, but enforcing a confeſſion of Faith, quite of another nature.* Though I could eaſily and juſtly retort him a ſharper anſwer, I ſay only this; the very Act againſt them calls them Seditious Conventicles: and openly to break ſo many known Laws of the land, after ſo many reinforcements, is not this to be *turbulent?* And was it not ever underſtood ſo in all Religions? even in heathen *Rome*? The moſt learned *P. Ærodius* tells us, when a ſort of Innovators kept their Conventicles in oppoſition to the way receiv'd among them of worſhipping their Gods, the Senate made an Act there ſhould be no ſuch Meetings, as tending to the diſturbance of the State, and the publique Peace. *Et ſi quis tale Sacrum ſolemne & neceſſarium duceret, and if any one judged ſuch a Sacrifice to be neceſſary*, and a Solemnity not to be omitted without a Crime, he was to repair to the Prætor, and the Prætor was to conſult the Senate, when there were at leaſt a hundred Senators preſent (ſo that the Rump of Parliament would not do neither); And if the Senate gave him leave, it muſt be with this condition, That when he performed his offices of Religion his own way, *ita id ſacrum faceret, dum ne plures quam quinque ſacrificio intereſſent, there ſhould not be above five perſons allow'd to be preſent at the Meeting.* The ſelf ſame number, beſides the Diſſenter's own Family, is ſo far forth endur'd by an Act of this preſent Parliament, that there muſt be more then *five* to make it a Conventicle: But what are 5 to 500? as commonly they meet: And are not ſuch Meetings formidable? and whatever is formidable to the Church and the State, is not that alſo Turbulent? And if they were thus ſolicitous to preſerve and eſtabliſh, as a ſacred inviolable thing the Idolatrous worſhip of their falſe Gods, what care of ours can be great enough to ſecure the Godly worſhip of the only True God, when it is ſhaken by ſuch Diviſions? But to return to St. *Auſtin*; how did the Civil Magiſtrate proceed to puniſh the Donatiſts for their ſedition? even by laying his Commands upon them, at that good Father's Requeſt, That they ſhould come to Church. A ſevere puniſhment and very likely indeed to be inflicted upon them, as Traytors to the Imperial Crown! *But ſecondly,*

condly, says he, *to answer more particularly this story, I suppose*, says he, *there is no man such a stranger to the world, as to be ignorant that there are Hypocrites in it; and such (for ought we know) these seeming converted Donatists might be, who for love of this World more than for love of the Truth, forsook their heretical Profession, though not their Opinion*, &c. Incomparable! *for ought he knows, they were Hypocrites!* So for ought we know, This Author is all this while a Jesuite, and writes this Pamphlet only to embroyl us Protestants. *But* he goes on; *unless it can be evidenc't, that these Donatists hearts were changed, as well as their Profession (a thing impossible to prove) all this proves nothing.* Very good! So unless it can be *evidenc't* that he writes all this Pamphlet from his *Heart* (which is impossible to be prov'd) it all signifies just *nothing*. *But thirdly*, says he, *put the case their hearts were really chang'd as to matter of belief, 'tis evident their hearts were very worldly still, groveling on the earth, not one step nearer Heaven.* A horrible charitable saying! we may forgive him any thing after this: as his supposing, in this next sentence, that the *pruning of the Tree by the Magistrate's Sword is doing evil.* As for his *putting the Case*, Malchus *had been converted by St.* Peter's *cutting off his ear*, and saying, *this would not have excus'd St.* Peter's *act, which our Saviour so sharply reprov'd, and threatned by perishing with the sword*: In the first place (*I humbly conceive*) St. *Peter* was no Civil Magistrate: unless he that will not allow him to draw ore Sword here as a private Person, will admit the fine Monkish conceit of *Ecce duo Gladii! behold here are two Swords*, the Spiritual and the Temporal for St. *Peter* and his Successors. And secondly, for his cutting of *Malchus*'s ear, I suppose there is some difference, between the Magistrat's *giving one an ear to hear with*, or compelling one to hearken and listen to reason; and cutting off ones ear, or setting one in the Pillory.

But all this, he says, *in reference to compelling men to believe or conform, still reserving to the Magistrate power according to Scripture to punish evil doers, not evil believers, not who think, but do publish or do practise something to subvert the Fundamentals of Religion, or disturb the Peace of the State, or injure their Neighbour. God, the only searcher of hearts, reserves to himself the*

punishment

puniſhment of evil thoughts, of evil belief, which man can never have a right cognizance of. And does he take all this pains only to put a fallacy upon us? and only to prove the truth of an old Adage, that *Thought is free?* And that no body can be puniſht in this world for his Thoughts only? or that it is all one for a thing not to be, and not to appear to be? But for all this, *evil believers*, if they profeſs their evil belief, plainly appear *evil doers*, and are to be treated accordingly: Though I ſpeak nothing more againſt them or their greateſt *Speakers*, than that they may be brought to our Churches, and give us a *fair hearing*.

Animadverſions upon his Appendix to the former Subject.

HIS Appendix to the former Subject begins with cenſuring the *modeſty* of our firſt Reformers, for their deference to the *Ancient Fathers and Councils.* We thank him for this reproach. *Hereby* (ſays he) *they were reduc't to great ſtraits in their Diſputations.* He ſhall find himſelf reduc't into much greater before we have done with him, for thus aſperſing and deſerting, both the *Ancients*, and the *Modern Fathers* (as I may ſtyle them) of this Church, and the Reformation. His reaſon for thus rejecting Antiquity is, becauſe *ſome Popiſh Errors were crept very early into the Church. The Superſtition of the Croſs and Chriſm were in uſe in the ſecond Century.* They were in uſe: but none were then allowed in any ſuperſtitious abuſe of them. As for *the Millenary Error, and the Neceſſity of Infants receiving the Bleſſed Sacrament*, (Errors indeed, but no Hereſies, and common Errors, but by no means to be charged on the Church Univerſal of thoſe Ages, which is but a Vulgar Error,) ſince *the Papiſts*, he confeſſes, *reject them* both, I hope theſe do not prove the Fathers Papiſts, nor yet Heretiques, that the Reformers ſhould balk them on theſe Surmiſes.

However this Reformer urges them where he thinks they ſerve his turn, *St.* Cyprian *tells us, that every Præpoſitus, which we call*

Biſhop, is to be guided by his own Reaſon and Conſcience; and is reſponſible to God only for his Doctrine. St. *Cyprian* only ſays in the place which he means (though he is not pleas'd to quote it) that a *Biſhop* was *Præpoſitus*, and *reſponſible to no other*: that is, to no other Biſhop, and particularly not reſponſible to the Biſhop of *Rome*. But St. *Cyprian* never ſays that a Biſhop is not reſponſible to the Church, or a Council of Biſhops, which without any uſurpation have always taken to themſelves the authority of calling even *Patriarchs* to an account for their Doctrine: as that *General Council* held at *Conſtantinople* by the Emperour *Conſtantinus Pogonatus*, judg'd, and condemn'd five Patriarchs at once, and *Honorius* the Pope of *Rome* for one of them.

But St. Auguſtine *believed it a direct Hereſie to hold there were any Antipodes.* 'Tis true, he held there were none, and rally'd thoſe that held there was any ſuch thing: This was for want of underſtanding the *Syſtem* of the World, which in thoſe Ages few underſtood before the late Diſcoveries. But St. *Auguſtine* is ſo little guilty of believing it either a *Direct* or an Indirect *Hereſie*, that he ſcarce makes Religion at all concern'd in it. And if he touch it only as a point of Philoſophy, then his Reputation of Wit is as ſafe as that of *Herodotus* and *Lucretius*, and many of the greateſt Wits, that made as fine Burleſques as he, upon this opinion of Antipodes. But if ſo great a Divine as St. *Auguſtine*, and ſo great a *Scholar* as *Lactantius* were liable to ſuch miſtakes for want of skill in the Mathematiques; Then why does this Author inveigh againſt that part of Learning for a Divine, in his *preaching Chapter*, p. 27. & 28?

He *can't but wonder that men of any brains or modeſty ſhould ſo groſly abuſe this ſaying of our Saviour, He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen and a Publican, ſpoken of private differences between man and man, to be referr'd to the Determination of the Church, that is the Congregation of the Faithful which they uſually and by order ſhould aſſemble in; and refer this to the Church in General, in matters of Faith, not in the leaſt pointed at there.* He will have much ado to make us believe that a man is not bound to tell his Brother of Hereſie, a matter of ſo great Conſequence, and to tell it to the Church, if his Brother will not

hear

hear him; and yet prove that he is bound to do this, in matter of private difference, or petty quarrel between them. Wherefore (to borrow his own Concluſion of this matter) *I paſs this over as very Impertinent.*

And ſo is that which follows, *I do not believe, nor am I bound by Scripture to believe ſuch Expoſitions as the Popiſh Church makes of this place, That the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church.* Who bids him believe the Popiſh Expoſitions? But if that place be not ſpoken of the Roman Church, therefore does it ſignifie nothing to prove the *Viſibility* or *Indefectibility* of the Catholique Church? But 'tis plain he advances the notion of a Church Inviſible, *a Church that ſhall be driven into the Wilderneſs* (where her Ninety nine Ceremonies are to be left to attend her) *ſcarce viſible in the World*: whereas the Learned underſtand that place of the Churche's Perſecutions the firſt three hundred years, which made it the more illuſtriouſly viſible: and our nineteenth Article calls it *the viſible Church of Chriſt.*

Now he *proceeds to the buſineſs of General Councils, whether they may Err in ſome points of Faith?* The Church of *England* acknowledges they *may Err, and have Err'd in things pertaining to God.* No doubt of it. But this Author immediately flies higher, with *a why not in ſome points of Faith. All the Evangelical Doctors grant* (ſays he) *that the later General Councils have Err'd: if ſo, why not the former?* what *promiſe had the former from Chriſt more than the later?* True, there is no more promiſe to a Council of the fourth Age, or to that of *Nice*, than to one that ſhould be held in the ſeventeenth, if it were as General and as free. He asks concerning *this promiſe, The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church, what's this to a general Council* (which is) *not the thouſandth part of the Clergy, nor the thouſand thouſandth part of the Church?* We ſhall find him miſtaken in this Account at long running. Laſtly, he ſhews his charitable Divination, in foretelling how much more miſchief General Councils would have done, if more of them had been conven'd. *But ſay you* (ſays he) *No General Council determin'd thoſe errors? Why? becauſe none was call'd about them: had any been call'd, who can doubt but they would have avow'd that in the Council, which they all taught in*

their Churches? This he ſays: but his *Yea's* and *Nay's* are no Oracles with us: For why ſhould they be, when a General Council is not ſo with him? Then preſently he *humbly craves pardon for his bold preſumption: viz.* of theſe hard ſayings againſt General Councils. And I as humbly beg leave to ſpeak for them in behalf of the Church of *England*, and the *Law* of the Land: both which I'me ſure I have on my ſide, and both give much deference to General Councils. The twentieth Article of our Church has theſe words, *The Church has Authority in matters of Faith*; And the Statute of the Land runs thus, (*Eliz.* 1. *c.* 1.) That none, however commiſſioned, *ſhall in any wiſe have authority or power to order or determine, or adjudge any Matter or Cauſe to be Hereſie, but only ſuch as heretofore have been determined, ordered or adjudged to be Hereſie, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the firſt four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council, wherein the ſame was declared Hereſie, by the expreſs and plain words of the ſaid Canonical Scriptures, or ſuch as hereafter ſhall be ordered, judged, or determined to be Hereſie by the Court of Parliament of this Realm with the Clergy in their Convocation.* But for all this we do not confeſs or acknowledge all or many of thoſe for General Councils, which they at *Trent*, or which *Bellarmine* is pleas'd to account for ſuch, a parcel of eighteen of them; But thoſe very few we count for General, which the Church *Univerſal*, before the unhappy breach between Eaſt and Weſt, receiv'd for General.

But now to unravel the skein which is much entangled and ruffled in his confuſed way, the diminutions he puts upon general Councils may be reduc'd to theſe three Heads.

1. That *General Councils may err in points of Faith*, becauſe they have *no promiſe to the contrary.*

2. Becauſe they want Numbers, even of the *Clergy*, being *not the thouſandth part of them:* and therefore (to put this Argument as far as ever it will go) are not truly General.

3. Becauſe of the prejudices they that ſhould ſit in Council would bring along with them; & then *who can doubt but they would avow that in the Council, which they all taught in their Churches?*

1. In anſwer to his firſt Exception, I premiſe theſe limitations.

If

If *by erring in some points of Faith*, he means some points belonging to the *Piety* of Faith (as Divines use to speak); or to the *Perfection* of Faith, or remotely belonging even to the *essence* or *necessity* of Faith, and wounding it by far-fetcht Consequences; I will not deny but even great Councils may possibly be circumvented for a time: yet I may safely venture (with our Learned & Pious Dr. *Hammond* in his *Paræneſis*) to reckon it among the *pié credibilia*, or a thing piously credible (as we say) that *God will not permit a Council truly General and Free to err in Fundamentals*; which thus far only I presume to explain, that God will never permit them to deny and declare against any *Fundamental Truth*, and much less to affirm and declare any *Fundamental Error* to be a Truth, and least of all to declare it a *Fundamental Truth*. And if this Author asks which of God's *Promises* give us encouragement to hope and believe this, I refer him to the Prophet *Isaiah*, ch. 30. v. 20. *And though the Lord give you the bread of Adversity, and the water of Affliction; yet shall not thy Teachers be removed into a Corner any more; but thine eye shall see thy Teachers.* That this Chap. is Evangelical will not, I suppose, be denied; and so is that *Isai.* 54. 17. *and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment shalt thou condemn.* If this be denied to be spoken of the Christian Church, I prove it undeniably from our Saviour's application of the Context. *And all thy Children shall be taught of God.* It was then a Prerogative of the Christian Church that her *Teachers* should be *driven into a corner no more*; that is, be *always Visible*, even when the Lord gave them *the bread of affliction*, that is, even in *times of Persecution*, as the lawful Catholick Bishops were never more Visible than when the intruding *Arrians*, that were far enough from being Lawful Bishops, persecuted them away from their Bishopricks, and drove their Persons indeed into *Corners*; yet they held intelligence, and kept exact correspondence with one another still, and with all their Flock's that persever'd in the Faith, and disowned the uncanonical *Arrian* Bishops. This they did by their *Literæ Formatæ*; by this method the Church preserv'd in her Communion her own Members amidst their Dispersions, and before any General Councils, except at *Jerusalem* held by the Apostles themselves, though the greatest Heresies arose early; by this

means

means they proclaim'd their Faith loudeſt of all, then when they were ſilenc'd and excluded by the *Arrians* from their own Pulpits; as the *Sufferings which happen'd to St.* Paul *fell out rather to the furtherance of the Goſpel. So that his bonds in Chriſt* were *manifeſt in all the palace, and in all other places, and many of the Brethren in the Lord waxing confident by his bonds, were much more bold to ſpeak the word without fear*; *Phil.* 1. 12, 13, 14. And if the Church has a power of *Condemning in judgment every tongue that riſes up againſt her*; I think this amounts to a promiſe, a glorious promiſe (and there are many ſuch) that all or near all the Biſhops in the Chriſtian world, ſhall never apparently fall from an *Outward Profeſſion* at leaſt of the Catholick *Faith in Fundamentals*, and *profeſs the quite contrary Hereſies* inſtead of them. And he that will not allow thus much at leaſt to the Church, muſt run into wild aery ſuppoſitions of *ſheep without any ſhepherds*, People without any Prieſts, a Church without any Orders, and as inviſible as the *Leviathan* makes it in his parallel between the *Church of Rome* and the *Kingdom of Fayries*. Thus far methinks this Author ſhould go along with me, for all his asking *What's this to a General Council? for the promiſe was made to the whole Body of the Church*; ſince even he acknowledges that the *Gates of Hell would prevail againſt Her*, if the Devil could ſo *wound the whole Body of the Church as to deſtroy the Vitals, the Fundamentals*: And if this be not a mortal wound to the *Body*, to loſe all its *Paſtors and Teachers* by their falling into formal and mortal Hereſie; then nothing at all can wound it deadly, but a total Diſſolution of all and every one of its members: and at this rate, this Author may fancy, as a certain great Enthuſiaſt did before him, that Himſelf alone might be the Catholick Church, and that it might wholly ſubſiſt in his Single Perſon. But he would fain avoid this inconvenience, though a General Council ſhould fall into ſuch Fundamental Errour, and perſiſt in it, becauſe Secondly (ſays he) *'Tis not the thouſandth part of the Clergy, nor the thouſand thouſandth part of the Church, which in the Scripture is always put for the whole Body of the Faithful, though of late it be tranſlated into quite another motion, and taken for the Clergy only.* I anſwer, if the *Church be always put for the whole Body*, yet the Clergy ſure are the *voice* or the *mouth of that Body*, and God has promiſed

miſed *Iſa.* 59, 20. *And the Redeemer ſhall come to Zion* (to put it out of doubt that all this Chapter is Goſpel;) *and unto them that turn from tranſgreſſion in* Jacob, *ſaith the Lord: As for me this is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my Spirit which is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord from henceforth and for ever*; Farther I add out of the Author's own confeſſion, in his Chap. *concerning Biſhops and Prieſts, The Church was always governed by Biſhops, that is by one, whatſoever you pleaſe to call him, ſet over the reſt of the Clergy, with Authority to ordain. to exhort, to rebuke, to judge and cenſure as he found cauſe: no other form of Government is mentioned by any Author for fifteen hundred years, from the Apoſtles downwards.* I make account then, that a General Council of Biſhops is, as *Tertullian* ſtyles it, *Repreſentatio totius nominis Chriſtiani*, a *Repreſentative of all that are called Chriſtians*, Inferiour Clergy as well as Laity; And what then if they are not the thouſandth part of the Clergy, nor the thouſand thouſandth part of the Laity? nay, to ſtrengthen his Argument, what if there is not actually met in Council the twentieth part of the Biſhops that are in the Chriſtian World? Suppoſe that all are invited with aſſurance of ſafe conduct to a place of ſecurity, and time enough allow'd for their convening, all which can never be effected without the conſent of Kings and Princes, and without that it never muſt be attempted: nevertheleſs, becauſe very many cannot poſſibly take ſuch a voyage, and muſt needs be abſent, it was never pretended to have the force of a General Council, till it was manifeſtly accepted by thoſe abſent Biſhops of the Church Univerſal whereſoever diſperſed, or at leaſt by the viſibly Major part of them, ſo that it might appear to any one at firſt glympſe (as they ſay) and without any ſcrupulous enquiry, which way their much greater number had declared themſelves. If there be ſtill a few Diſſenters 'tis inconſiderable, as what were ſeventeen *Arrian* Biſhops (for there were no more *Arrians* that were lawful Biſhops) in the Council of *Nice*, where there were three hundred and eighteen Catholique Paſtors, equal almoſt to the number of Servants bred up in the Houſe of *Abraham*?

I know not then what they mean that would evacuate and annihilate almoſt the whole authority of general Councils, by ſending us to *Ortelius*'s Mapps or Geographical Tables, bidding us take a ſurvey of all the great Cathedrals or Metropolitical Churches, and then demand of us whether there were ever any Councils ſo Oecumenical from which above half the Biſhops of theſe Sees were not abſent? True; but if they were preſent upon their own *Charges*, and did but what would be certainly required and exacted of them there, or wherever they were; they muſt needs *accept*, *ſubſcribe*, *recite*, *publiſh*, and *preach*, and *cauſe to be preacht* over all their *Dioceſes*, the *Decrees* concerning the *Faith*, ſuch as the *Nicene Creed* or the *Conſtantinopolitan*: Nay, the Biſhops did many times ſummon *Provincial* and *National Councils* to ſit a little before and at the ſame time with the *General*, on purpoſe to ratifie and ſpread their Decrees. And if any Council was pretended to be General and Free when it was not ſo, as was the ſecond of *Nice*, which being overaw'd by an Imperious woman *Irene*, decreed *Image-worſhip*, Immediately two or three other great Weſtern Councils, as that of *Francfort* in *Germany*, and that at *Paris*, and the Britiſh Biſhops, declar'd themſelves openly againſt it. And *Charles* the Great himſelf wrote againſt it. Whilſt this exact Correſpondence was among all the Biſhops of the Catholique Church, and in every Dioceſe between the Biſhop and his Clergy, and all his Flock, then as one of the Fathers glories, *If any man askt the way to the Catholique Church, no Heretique had the face to ſhew him the way to his particular Church, as if that were the Catholique.* And thus although *the Body of the Clergy* be a *thouſand times* greater (as this Author obſerves) then any Council, and for this very reaſon for their unmanageable numbers, cannot be convened in one place, nor their *Suffrages* gathered, yet 'tis obſervable that the *Univerſality* or whole *Fraternity of Chriſtians* that were *in the Apoſtles Fellowſhip* or *Communion*, had honourable mention made of them and of their concurrence in the *Letter of Deciſion* from that *firſt Apoſtolical Council* in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles. And ſo the *Legates* of Princes and ſeveral Learned *Prieſts* and *Deacons* have been *Aſſeſſors* to *General Councils*, but no *Voters* there (for that were endleſs) *& conſentiendo ſubſcripſere*,

ſcripſere (that is) ſubſcribed *their aſſent and conſent*; therefore our Author is not to think it a *Monopoly* of ours, though the *word Church be* ſometimes *uſed* and *taken* for the *Clergy* only: for as I ſhew'd before, there can be *no ſheep without Shepherds*, ſo 'tis an equal abſurdity to imagine, that *the Shepherds ſhould be preſerved without their ſheep.*

But if he will grant any thing at all by way of deference to the *Churche's Judgment*, he muſt not talk to us of *the whole Body*, nor of his *thouſands* and *thouſand thouſands*, for fear of falling into the new *oral-Tradition way*, that rare invention of learning what is the Faith, by ſifting and finding out (if we can) what was held *at all times, and in all places, by all the Midwives*, and the *Dry-Nurſes*, and the *Common People*.

I come now to his laſt pretence againſt the Churche's Authority in General Councils, The Prejudices they that ſhould ſit in Council would bring along with them: and then *who can doubt but they would avow that in the Council, which they all taught in their Churches?*

This again is a piece of my Author's unthought of Popery, for the Papiſts are not able to endure Councils free and truly General, which never fail'd to ſwinge their Popes and their Popery too; that is, the Quinteſcence of it *the Popes Supremacy*: as no doubt they would condemn many other of their Doctrines and Practices, but that as there have been no ſuch Councils of later Ages, ſo indeed there was no ſuch Church of *Rome* in former Ages when there were ſuch *Councils*: and the *Council of Trent* has made their Church ſo quite another thing, that we may well retort them their own Queſtion, *Where was your Church before* Luther? Now ask them for any *Decree* of a General Council for *praying to Saints*, or *worſhipping Images*, or the like, if we reject the Council of *Trent* (as we would do the Aſſembly of Divines at *Weſtminſter*) they reply, the *viſibly major part of the Church*, both *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, have introduced it: and (as our Author expreſſes himſelf in another Inſtance) *They all* have *taught it in their Churches*, therefore if they met in Council, *who can doubt but they would avow it?* I deſire to remind theſe over-haſty Opiniators of that well known and remarka-

ble ſtory concerning *Paphnutius*, at the *Sacred Oecumenical Council of Nice*: when the Queſtion was debated earneſtly there, *Whether married Prieſts ſhould be ſeparated from their wives? or no?* and when the Major part of Biſhops inclin'd to the wrong ſide, even to forbid them cohabiting any longer, the great *Paphnutius* ſtood up and ſet them right; proving *the ancient Tradition or Cuſtom of the Church to the contrary*: And with one Speech he turn'd the whole Council: for it is one thing to ſtrike at random, as commonly Polemical Authors do, or to oppoſe thoſe paſſages in their Adverſaries books, which are ready to fall of themſelves, and to paſs by thoſe which urge and preſs them harder; and quite another thing to keep one another to a point, till it comes to an iſſue upon the whole affair: But this can hardly be when two Controvertiſts are as far diſtant from each other in place, as they are in opinion. But if ſober, good and learned men were conven'd and met, prepared with ſtudy, not for a vain wrangle or victory, but for a mature deliberation to give ſuch an account of their Belief, that all might end in ſome fixt determination, after full conviction; If *Præſidents* and *Moderators* were deſign'd, with one to do the office of a *Prolocutor* or *Speaker*, to ſee that all might be done orderly, and proceed in ſtrict and punctual form of Argument (a Method which this Author ſo often declares againſt, that he will not be this *Prolocutor*.) If the *Ratiocinators* on both ſides might have daies given them, to recal any thing that ſlipt inconſiderately from them, that there might be no lying at the catch (as they ſay;) If ſuch a Conference as this were protracted from time to time, till all were ripen'd for an iſſue; If there were ready at hand all books that would be of uſe, *Fathers* eſpecially, and Former Councils, and above all the Holy Bible placed upon its Throne (as it was the cuſtom to place it in Ancient Councils;) If I durſt hope to ſee but ſuch a Council as this, then I would hope to ſee the Church reſtor'd to all her Ancient ſplendor and Serene glory. For I will but appeal to this Author (if we may compare thoſe great things with our leſſer affairs) if he has ever done any exerciſe at Divinity-Diſputations in an Univerſity, what a vaſt difference there

there is between ſitting in ones ſtudy and writing ſuch *Pamphlets*, as his and mine; and defending in the School a material *Queſtion in Theology*, where one ſtands a *Reſpondent* encloſed within the compaſs of his Pew; as *Popilius* the *Roman* Embaſſador to King *Antiochus*, made a circle with his wand about that Prince, and bid him give him a determinate anſwer before he went out of it. Which puts me in mind of a certain Pope's reply (and it was a very ſhrewd one) when he was importun'd to call the Council of *Trent*, he put them off a great while with this Anſwer, that he would *not fight with a Cat in a Cupbord*; meaning, he was loth to contend with all the Prælacy ſhut up together, for then he knew they would *flie in his face*; and ſo they did in the faces of his Succeſſors, notwithſtanding all their Artifices: whereas he could deal well enough with them ſeverally and at a diſtance; And it is no wonder at all, if the Biſhops of the *Diffuſive Church* are fain to ſuffer and groan under many of the Papal Abuſes, which they might eaſily remedy and reform, if they were protected (as they ought to be) by all Chriſtian Kings and Princes, in meeting and acting freely. But incomparably beyond any ſhort and curſory Debates (ſuch as our Diſputations in Univerſities muſt needs be) are the advantages of a free General Council (but *Trent* was neither Free nor General) to bring things in debate to a concluſion. I ſpeak now only of thoſe advantages that are in the nature of the thing it ſelf: what ſhall I ſay then of the Supernatural Aſſiſtances, from the Bleſſing of Heaven upon ſuch a Meeting? For though it be promiſed, *Whereſoever two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midſt of them*, yet ſure St. *Paul* ſtrengthens the Argument, 2 *Cor.* 4. 15. *that the abundant Grace might through the thankſgiving of many, redound to the glory of God.* For by parity of Reaſon, if the *Thankſgivings*, then the *Judgments*, and the *Cenſures*, and the *Decrees* of *many*, if not *all the Governers* of the *Church*, either met in one place, or afterwards conſenting to the ſame thing, muſt alſo *redound to the glory of God.* Whom therefore he diſhonours by Prophecying thus aforehand, that *if any General Councils had been called*, they would have miſcarried.

And ſo I have done with his two firſt Chapters concerning Articles of Faith; upon which I have been the longer out of a juſt Indignation, to ſee a man in his Enthuſiaſtick fit threſhing of *Fathers*, and *Councils*, and *Faith*, and all into ſplinters. For what is behind, though he will ever and anon enforce me to make a ſevere reflection, yet it will hardly be capable all along of a ſerious refutation.

Animadverſions on his Chapter concerning Ceremonies.

I Have ſeen the Picture of an old Lawyer with this inſcription upon it, that for a time he was the only Serjeant at Law in *England*; and then he appeared at the Common Pleas for Plaintiff and for Defendant, and ſaid what he could ſay on either ſide with great indifference to both. So one would think this officious Advocate thought himſelf the only Divine in *England*, and that in this caſe of Ceremonies he had a priviledg of ſpeaking *pro* and *con*. But he quickly ſhews himſelf ſo *earneſt a Pleader* for one party (for ſo he magnifies himſelf to the Non-conformiſts *in his Charitable Admonition*, p. 64.) that he makes himſelf a party againſt the other. He begins this Chapter with condemning the Non-couformiſts *for breaking an evident Commandment without as clear evidence from Scripture*, (which he expreſsly affirms they have none, either againſt *Church-Service*, p. 22. or againſt the *Ceremonies*, p. 64.) *to ſatisfie themſelves in a doubtful matter, which* (ſaies he) *without doubt is damnable*. But he ends this Chapter with a long Speech he puts in our Saviour's mouth, pronouncing, as at the day of Judgment, the very Sentence of Damnation againſt the Governers of the Church, and Exacters of Obedience to its Laws: *Had I mercy on you, and ſhould not you have had mercy on your fellow-Servants? with the ſame meaſure you meted, it ſhall be meaſured to you again. I tremble to go farther.* So do I tremble at this bold Harangue. But where are his Reaſons? Why, if Rational

Rational and Pathetical be all one, we ſhall have demonſtrations enough. But touch any of his flowers of Rhetorick, and 'tis hardly worth the while to ſtand ſtill, and ſee them fall in pieces of themſelves. Reduce his Declamation into form of Argumentation, and then he wi l make another Declaration (as we ſhall find one anon in his Chapter about *Preaching*) againſt *Syllogiſms* and *Enthymems*, and that Logick which diſcovers fallacies in Ratiocination, as clearly as Arithmetick does cheats in our other accounts.

Firſt then he flouriſhes in the Air againſt the Surplice. *What wiſe and loving Father would put a Winding ſheet on his head to fright his weak and ſimple Child?* A Similitude is not bound to run upon four legs (as they ſay) but this of the *Winding-ſheet* is ſo lame it has ne're a good one; for do we wear our Surplices (as the *Turks* do their Turbant) on our *heads?* I have heard indeed of one that wore his Surplice upon his *heel*: He was a kind of Halfquarter-conformiſt, and when he came into the Reading-pew where he muſt put on his whites, he uſed to hold up one of his legs behind him (like a Gooſe) and reſting it upon his Matt, he would hang the Surplice upon his foot, that he might be able to *ſwear*, he both *wore the Surplice*, and *bow'd the knee* at the Name of Jeſus. This man indeed did not take a courſe to *fright* the People with the Surplice. But now to ſpeak *really* (as this Author uſes to ſpeak) is a Miniſter in a Surplice a ſight ſo terrible, that any one ſhould be *really* troubled in mind at it? we read indeed in the laſt of St. *Mark*, that when the holy *Women entring into the Sepulchre*, *ſaw a young man clothed in a long white garment, they were affrighted.* But St. *Matthew* informs us, that *his countenance was like lightning.* No wonder then if they were afraid. 'Twas the habit wherein Angels by the will of God almoſt conſtantly appeared: The colour which our Bleſſed Saviour choſe when he entertain'd his particular *Favourites* with ſome gracious manifeſtations of his *Majeſtatick* preſence, and was *transfigured* before them: *His rayment was white as Snow, beyond what any Fuller on earth can white it.* Such Veſts the glorious Saints are deſcrib'd, to our underſtanding, to put on in heaven, *as clothed* there *in pure white linnen.* But after

all

all that has been ſpoken and written heretofore in defence of the Surplice, if any ſtill are troubled in Conſcience at it (for that he means by *frighting* the *weak and ſimple Children*) we muſt tell them, *They are afraid where no fear is*: and the *Pſalmiſt* makes that no very good Character; And we muſt adviſe them out of the Apoſtle; *Brethren, be not Children in Underſtanding, but in Malice be ye Children, but in Underſtanding be men.*

But now he offers at a Reaſon for laying aſide the Ceremonies upon the ſame prudential conſideration that prevail'd with the Reformers from Popery to retain ſome of them: becauſe then the People were for them, *but now they are paſſionate againſt them.*

To this he firſt anſwers for us, and perhaps with more reaſon than he is aware, *that many of our Flock are as zealous for theſe things, as others againſt them.* It may be ſo, and I hope they are as zealous as they ought to be, for *it is good to be zealouſly affected alwaies in a good thing*, Gal. 4. 18. And we (ſaies he) *had rather gratifie the obedient Conformers, than the Diſobedient Gainſayers.*

And that the *rather* becauſe it cannot be gain-ſaid, but *the obedient Conformers* are very conſiderable too for their very Numbers, as well as for their exemplary Piety to God and their eminent Loyalty to the King. A certain importunate Mediatour (ſuch an one as our Author makes himſelf) for the Diſſenting Brethren, argued thus with a Reverend great Prelate. My Lord (ſaid he) Why will you give offence to ſo many of us by impoſing ſeveral things which your ſelves confeſs *not neceſſary?* Why (ſaid the Biſhop) and your ſelves confeſs thoſe things are *not unlawful*; O but (replied the Advocate) ſome of our Party think thoſe things *unlawful*, and ſome of ours (anſwered the Biſhop) think them *Neceſſary* (and for order and decency ſome Ceremonies ſure are *Neceſſary.*) Well, but cannot you perſwade your men (ſaid the Other)? and cannot you (ſaid the Biſhop) prevail with yours? So the Diſpute ended, nor was it indeed poſſible for any Solid man (granting that we do not clog our Communion with any thing unlawful) to ſay more for them, without

out ſpeaking againſt them, and confeſſing their weakneſs, or their wilfulneſs, that they could not, or would not be *perſwaded*. And if this be reaſon enough why they muſt be gratified and humoured in every thing, then it follows that only Knaves and Fools muſt govern the world.

Secondly I anſwer, if the *Surplice with other things were* (as he confeſſes) *wiſely and piouſly retain'd by the Reformers from Popery, when probably many long nouriſh'd up in thoſe Ceremonies, would not have come into the Church, had all thoſe been caſt out*; Then it would be *imprudently* (not to ſay *impiouſly*) done of us (who ought in purſuance of that moſt bleſſed work, the Reformation, to make it ſtill our aim and deſign to bring the Papiſts at home and abroad into the Communion of our Church) if we ſhould ſet them further off by turning out all our Ceremonies; ſeveral of which ('tis true) are theirs alſo; but many Ages before they were either theirs or ours, they were the Primitive Church's: and therefore to think them Popiſh for being alſo theirs, is as ſenſeleſs as to think there was Popery before *Noah*'s Flood. And if the Church of *England*, which is now the terrour of *Rome*, and the glory of all Proteſtant Churches, be thus conſidered as a part (undoubtedly the beſt and happieſt part) of the Catholick Church, whoſe members are innumerable, and all of them, both in the Greek and Latin Churches, nay in ſeveral of the Proteſtant Churches, eſpecially the Lutheran, are far more addicted to Ceremonies than we in the Church of *England*, and uſe almoſt all the ſame Ceremonies, and others like them; then certainly we ſhould give offence to almoſt the whole Chriſtian world (whereas we ought to *give them none*, though they were *Jews* or *Gentiles*) if we ſhould aboliſh all our Ceremonies. Then how ill does this Author argue in crying, *the People, the People are paſſionately againſt the Ceremonies*, and putting the buſineſs on this iſſue of counting Noſes?

But thirdly I anſwer, this is Trying the Church of *England*, as they did its Sacred Defender in the name of the Commons of *England*, when they had not one in ten of their Party. Nay perhaps Diſſenters properly ſo call'd, are not in ſome Dioceſes above one in twenty. Many abſent themſelves from our Churches

one

out of pure Indevotion and Lazineſs. Many frequent the Meeting-houſes out of Curioſity, and many for want of room in their Churches and Tabernacles at *London*, or becauſe of their diſtance from their own Pariſh Churches in the Country. The ſtiff and irreconcilable Diſſenters appear to be a handful of men in compariſon.

And this I hope is enough to anſwer this old bug-bear-Argument ſtarted by thoſe that found out the trick of gathering hands, and muſtering up the Broom-men and the Chimney-ſweepers to cry *no Biſhops*.

Then he raiſes an Objection for us, and anſwers it after a faſhion. *But you have no hopes of gaining him: you believe 'tis not Conſcience but Faction and wilful perverſneſs keeps him off. Oh! do not deſpair, believe better of him, &c.* We are very far from *Deſpairing*, if good means be uſed, and the right courſe be taken. And we can hardly believe worſe of the Diſſenters, than this Author would make us believe of them; for *p* 24. this Author ſtyles them *blind and wilful Separatiſts*. And *is it not apparently wilfulneſs and faction? I beſeech you, my Brethren, take heed of thus diſſembling with God and the World, or take heed of giving your ſelves up to the Deluſions of a miſtaken Spirit.* And *p.* 65. *'tis moſt evident* their *Spirit ſavours ſomething of the Phariſee, the proud Phariſee*. But whereas he is pleas'd to reinforce theſe Objections againſt the Diſſenter in our behalf, *But you know it is ſo with him*; (viz. *that we have no hopes of gaining him, &c.*) Indeed *we know* no ſuch thing; but the quite contrary, *we know very many* that have been as highly prejudic'd in their Education, and yet have ſubmitted afterward to clear Conviction, and are now very uſeful men in the Church of *England*.

But I take no pleaſure in giving this Author the mortification of anſwering himſelf by his own contradictory Propoſitions. That here which bears any colour of Reaſon, is only this, that *we ſhould yield the more to ſave his ſoul: and we ſhould cover a multitude of our own ſins.* I anſwer if that be true which he ſaies, and which I fear, that they do *thus diſſemble with God*, then to frame a new Law

to

to ſerve their turn, is to countenance, and as it were eſtabliſh Hypocriſie by a Law. If they *have cover'd their ſin, like* Adam, *and hide their iniquity in their boſome*, this would but make them *add ſin to ſin*: and ſo inſtead of *covering a multitude of* our own *ſins*, we ſhall only *follow a Multitude to do evil.*

His next addreſs is to the Biſhops, with, *Oh! my Fathers, my Fathers.* But (*oh!* the pity of it that twenty ſuch *Oh*'s will not amount to one Reaſon;) his humble requeſt to them is, that *they would vouchſafe to read the fourteenth Chapter to the* Romans. Since he is not pleas'd to draw any Argument thence into any form (and becauſe I ſhall meet him again pelting of this Text anon) my humble Anſwer ſhall be likewiſe by way of requeſt to him, that he would vouchſafe to read Biſhop *Sanderſon*'s Excellent Sermon upon the third verſe of that Chapter, *Let not him that eateth not, deſpiſe him that eateth*, &c. That Biſhop I hope was no Perſecutor, and yet he plainly ſhews, that reſtraining ſome mens Extravagancies by good Orders, and requiring Obedience to thoſe orders, is not that which this Authour is pleas'd to call *Reſtraining the Liberty of the Goſpel to the rigidity of their Diſcipline.*

Then he bids us gravely *to build our Church on a Rock, and not on the Sand of Ceremonies.* And again, *this is a very ſandy and dirty foundation.* Our Church (God be thank't) is not now to be built, but upheld againſt ſuch as himſelf, who, like Her in the Proverbs, *plucketh it down with* his *own hands.* Who ever before wandred into ſuch an Extravagant Suppoſition, as if we made our *Ceremonies* our *Foundation*? yet, by his favour, as contemptible as theſe Materials are of *Sand* and Dirt, if every one may be allowed to pick out all the Morter that is made up of them, the Houſe muſt fall. But *is not the Body more than Rayment? Subſtance more than Ceremonie?* Little did our Saviour intend that ſaying againſt the Surplice. But (to follow this Author in his aiery race) what if *the Body* (that is the *Subſtance*) be *more than Rayment*, (that is than the *Ceremony*)? yet the *Ceremony* is not nothing. And

if he takes away all the *Rayment* with his *Naked Truth*, he will leave it such a *Naked Church*, without either Ornament, or Covering, that it shall never be able to hold out against the *storms* with which he thunders and threatens us.

To his next fine mock at our Ceremonies, as if they were Novelties, and saying, that *in those great Storms, when the whole World of Jews and Gentiles were Enemies to the Church, there was not one of our Ceremonies to preserve it.* First, I demand, Is it Reason the Church should be as Unceremonious now in the times of her Settlement, as then in the days of her Persecution? Now that there is a Church at the end of almost every mile, as then when there was hardly one in twenty miles? Now when the Soveraign Powers of the World spread their wings to cover and protect her, as then when *they stretcht out their Arms to vex her*? Now when *Kings* and *Queens, her Nursing-fathers, and Nursing-mothers*, bid her quit her Cave and shew her *beauteous* face in stately Cathedrals, as then when she was fain to hide her self *in the Wilderness*, and her Members were forc'd to *wander about in Sheep skins*?

But then again he contradicts himself to say *there was not one of our Ceremonies in* those *Primitive Times*, for p. 10. he contends *the Superstition of the Cross* (as he very mannerly terms it) *was in use in the second Century.* That the *Cross* was used in Baptism very betimes (which is the only *superstitious* use we make of it) there are Testimonies enow. St. *Cyprian*'s known words (de lapſ. *in principio*) are these, *Frons cum signo Dei Pura, Coronam Diaboli ferre non potuit, Coronæ se Domini reservavit. Those Foreheads which the Sign of God had purified* (*viz.* in the Baptismal Ablution and Confirmation) *abhorr'd the Garlands of Satan, and reserv'd themselves to be crowned by God:* And the same Father again (Tom. 1. lib. 4. ep. 6. *Pamelii*) *Muniatur Frons, ut Signum Dei incolume servetur. Arm your Foreheads* unto all Boldness, *that the Sign of God may be kept safe.* A parallel place to which is that of St. *Austin* (Tom 8. p 262. E.) upon Psal. 68. *Frontosus esto: Quid times fronti tuæ, quam Signo Crucis armasti?* (i.e.) *Be not weak foreheaded* (*viz.* in the Cause of God) *why art thou afraid for thy forehead, which*

thou

thou haſt arm'd with the Sign of the Croſs? For the *Surplice*, the Teſtimonies of St. *Chryſoſtome* and St. *Hierome*, that the Prieſts in the ancient Church officiated in *white Veſtments*, are well enough known. For *kneeling at the Euchariſt*, and *bowing at the Altar*, I give an account of their Antiquity, when he leads me to ſay more of them. If he wonders why I bring but three or four Teſtimonies for our 99 *Ceremonies* (as he calls them afterward.) I anſwer, there are but three or four Ceremonies that I know of; But for a need there are 99 Teſtimonies for them.

By this time he has ſpoken ſo much againſt the *Surplice*, that now he thinks it his part to ſay ſomething for it: and at the ſame time to tell us *why he appears ſo great an Enemy to it*; (for he *confeſſes he is ſo*) *becauſe ſuch dirty naſty* Surplices, *as moſt of them wear, and eſpecially the Singers in Cathedrals, where they ſhould be moſt decent, is rather an intimation of their Dirty lives: and has given* his *ſtomach ſuch a ſurfeit of them, as* he has *almoſt an averſeneſs to all.* This is a ſtrong Line and a weak Argument: Such another weighty exception to the *Surplice*, as was made by the merry Country Parſon, who call'd it a *Rag of Popery*: and when he was cited for it into the Spiritual Court, he made it appear by the Pariſh-book of Accounts, that *their Surpliee was bought in Queen* Mary's *days, and therefore it was truly a Rag of Popery, being worn all to pieces: But if the Pariſh would provide him a new one, he was ready to put it on the next Sunday.* The honeſt man was diſmiſt with his Jeſt: But alas! our Author is in earneſt. Though a Laundreſs may anſwer this, as eaſily as a Semſtreſs might anſwer the other Argument. Mean time we can only be ſorry that he is ſo ſqueamiſh, and that his ſick fancy ſhould be ſo much too hard for his *Judgment*; for in the foregoing Sentence, he, *in his own Judgment much approves a pure white Robe on the Miniſter's ſhoulders, to put him in mind what* Purity *becomes a Miniſter of the Goſpel.* He *much approves it*, yet within the compaſs of ſix lines, he has *almoſt an averſeneſs* to all of it. But we muſt not change whatſoever is Ancient and Decent in our Church, as often as any one (whoever he be) pleaſes to change his note, and to acquaint

us in the ſame breath with his admirable *Sympathies* and *Antipathies* to the ſame thing. His laying this ugly charge to *moſt* of us, that we *wear ſuch dirty naſty Surplices*, is to fling dirt enough that ſome might ſtick. As for *the Singing-men in Cathedrals*, if they are ſo much to blame, as he ſuppoſes they are, either for *their dirty Surplices*, or, as he intimates, for *their dirty Lives*, yet order may be eaſily taken, that neither of theſe (to follow his noble Metaphor) ſhall *ſcape a ſcowring*, without taking quite away either the *Surplices* or the *Singing-men* out of our Cathedrals. But if he follow the grain of this old thred-bare Fallacy, from the abuſes againſt the uſe of any thing, whither will it carry him? The *Surplices* in Cathedrals are commonly foul, therefore let them be taken away for ever: ſo the Cathedrals themſelves ſometimes are none of the cleaneſt, therefore (inſtead of ſweeping them) let them be pull'd down and taken away too.

His next Effort is againſt *bowing towards the Altar*; which *in his own Judgment* he *allows and practiſes in ſome meaſure*. Then, I hope, the thing it ſelf is not unlawful. No; but *truly many of our Church men give great ſuſpicion to the People, that they alſo believe (as the Papiſts) Chriſt corporally preſent there*. If we give this *great Suſpicion*, we give great Scandal, which is a great Crime in us, if it be true. But it is a great Scandal to ſay this of us, if it be not true. But how do we give this great Suſpicion? *becauſe* (ſays he) *the Miniſter or the Reader does not only bow once at his entring into the Church, but bows* again as he has occaſion to paſs and repaſs by the Altar; *Surely* (ſays he, ſpeaking the Apprehenſion of the Vulgar) *in reverence to the King of Kings he ſuppoſes there ſitting*. What! even at thoſe times when there is no Communion? and yet at thoſe times there's the ſame *bowing*. This is demonſtration enough againſt ſuch an odious Suppoſition of our believing Chriſt *corporally preſent there*. We do not then give them this *great Suſpicion*: 'tis not a Scandal given, but cauſeleſsly taken. So, for any thing he has done upon this point, I may conclude it as he does, *'tis done with little or no Reaſon, and with a great deal of Superſtition*.

He proceeds to *that grand debated Ceremony* (as he calls it, and

and therefore we must dwell the longer upon it) *of kneeling at the Lord's Supper.* And first, he honestly grants that we are to perform this act of Devotion *with all possible Reverence.* I ask no more. But he quickly nulls his grant: *Is this* (says he) *to be exprest altogether in the outward posture of the Body?* No certainly: nor *altogether* in the *inward posture* and frame of the *Soul*: but in *Soul* and *Body both together*: or else, I trow, there is not *all possible Reverence.* Well, *If outward Humility be the thing we contend for, we ought to shew it to our God in the humblest way, and that is by prostrating rather than kneeling.* Pray let them vouchsafe to *kneel* with us before they talk of falling lower. *Kneeling* is a posture of greatest Reverence in these Western parts of the World, where *Prostrating* is not much in use: and 'tis a Gesture most convenient for the Devout Receiver, who as he *kneels* may abase himself to the Dust, and again (with the Royal Votary) *may lift up his hands to God, and may look up.*

But he runs away with it for certain, that *our Lord Christ administred the Sacrament, and that the Disciples receiv'd it sitting. And sure he remembers our Saviour best, who doth every thing as he did, both in Substance and Ceremony; and so we find the Primitive Christians did,* &c. In answer to this I demand how does it appear that the Apostles *receiv'd it sitting*? because they sate down to supper? But it appears from the Text, the posture they us'd at Supper was alter'd before they communicated. St. *John*'s words are express, that *Supper was ended,* and that *Jesus rose from Supper,* and then *washt the Disciples feet.* Now the word Δεῖπνον alone without κυριακὸν, where does it ever signifie *the Lord's Supper?* it seems that followed after it. So this Author can never bring the least good proof from Scripture that they sate at the first Eucharist. Now for any one to fasten that upon Divine Revelation, which he has no ground to infer either from the *written Rule* or the *Church*'s *Testimony,* what is it but *adding to the Word of* God? And then let me ask him his own Question, *p.* 3. *How they will avoid that curse in the last of the* Revelations, *if they add to the words there written?*

Sure I am that in whatever Posture the Apostles were first admit-

admitted, which is uncertain, yet it was such as wise and sober men, and the custom of the Country allow'd, as a Posture expressing Reverence, because (as this Author himself has set it down) *Sure Christ would not have allow'd any unfitting posture.* In the mean time the Dissenter cannot deny but that the words of Administration, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul to everlasting Life*, are an excellent good Prayer. Now if they will not give us a reason why it is *unlawful to kneel*, I will give them a reason why it is simply *unlawful* (except in case of necessity, as for those that lye on their Sick-beds, or the like, &c.) *to sit and pray solemnly*, (for I speak not of sudden, short, ejaculatory Prayers, but) I say, 'tis simply unlawful to pray *thus solemnly* to the most high God in a sitting posture; because it is simply *unlawful* to pray *most solemnly* in an *unpraying posture*, (if I may use such a word). Therefore this Author is too liberal of that which is none of his own, in allowing, that *a man may receive sitting without any Irreverence.*

But he tells us *so we find the Primitive Christians did.* What does he mean? (for here he is somewhat obscure) that the primitive Christians *receiv'd it sitting?* or that they did not alwaies *receive it kneeling?* 'Tis true, the Ancient Church many times *receive it standing*, as all the fifty daies between *Easter* and *Whitsontide*, and on some other Festivals. There's a fair difference sure between *sitting* and *standing*. *Standing* we find is a *Posture* for *Solemn Prayer* in the Scripture: so is not *sitting*. But let him shew, if he can, that the primitive Saints, on other daies, working or fasting daies, (for St. *Augustin* and St. *Basil* both agree in witnessing that sometimes there were Communions on Wednesdaies and Fridaies) let them prove, I say (or else they prove little to the purpose) that on those daies, when they *kneeled* at the other Prayers, they ever rose to receive the Communion *standing*. For the Fathers tell us plainly, they forbore *kneeling* then merely out of an Excess of Joy. Most plainly *Tertullian* renders a general account why they intermitted all their strictness, that is, all that might infeeble the Knees, or weary the Flesh at this season, *Quid im-*

pe-

pedit, niſi neceſſitas gaudii? What hinders (ſaies he) *but the neceſſity of Joy or Exultation?* But 'tis certain the *primitive Chriſtians* were very far from ſitting at the Holy Euchariſt, which this Author raſhly concludes they *did*; for they did not at any of their Prayers or Religious *Offices*: much leſs at *this* the moſt ſolemn of all their *Services*. For *Tertullian* upon that Suppoſition which was generally receiv'd, that the Holy Angels were inviſibly preſent at the devout *Prayers* of the Church, or of good Chriſtians in private, to offer them up to God (not that he ſuppoſes thoſe Angels had any Prayers offered to themſelves, for all they were ſuppos'd to be ſo nigh at hand; as the Prophet *Elijah*, when he knew God's Army of Angels actually incompaſs't him round, yet praies to God, and not to the Angels, or any of the Captains of that heavenly Hoſt, that his affrighted Servant might have the Grace to ſee them, *Lord open his eyes*; And *Abraham*'s Steward the good *Eliázar*, though the Prophet his Maſter had told him that God's Angel ſhould go along with him in his way, yet all the way he praies to none but *to the Lord God of* his *Maſter Abraham*; yet upon this ſuppoſition, that an Angel alwaies ſtood by whilſt men were devoutly praying, *Tertullian*) in his Book *de Oratione cap.* 12. is highly diſpleaſed with thoſe that offer to ſit down immediately after their Prayers are done: and how much leſs is that than to ſit at their very *Sacramental Prayers?* But I do not alledge *Tertullian* for this or that zealous Opinion of his, but as a Reporter of the Church's practice, and there where he is plain and full (as he is here) he may be allowed for a Demonſtrator in matter of Fact. And thus he declares himſelf in this place, which is not ſo commonly noted, againſt thoſe that did but ſit down at their eaſe juſt after their Prayers. *Eo apponitur & irreverentiæ crimen*, &c. *To this* (ſaies he) *may be added, that it is ſuch a criminal irreverence, as may eaſily be underſtood even by the Heathens themſelves, if they have any ſenſe about them; for ſure 'tis irreverend to ſit down under the view, and plac'd as it were over-right the view of that Perſon for whom you have the higheſt Reverence and Veneration, how much more is it not moſt irreligious to do ſo in view of the Living God, while the Angel*

that

that attended at the Prayers is yet ſtanding by ; unleſs we have a mind to upbraid God that our prayers have tired us ? But if we pray with *Modeſty and Humility, we ſhall ſo much the more commend our Prayers to God.* Now let Heaven and Earth judg, whether the primitive Chriſtians *ſate at receiving* the Sacrament or no ? I ſhall make one Obſervation more upon this whole matter, that although *comprehenſion* be the only thing he pretends, yet there muſt needs be *Toleration* at the bottom of it. 'Tis true indeed that *p.* 23. though he *deſires ſuch a form of Service, ſuch Ceremonies alſo to be eſtabliſht, as may give moſt general ſatisfaction, yet* he *deſires what is eſtabliſht may be generally obſerv'd, and not a liberty left (as ſome do propoſe) to add or detract Ceremonies or Prayers according to the various Opinions and Humours of Men: for certainly this would cauſe great Faction and Diviſion,* &c. I ſuppoſe he means well here, but quite contrary to his own Principle, *p.* 19. where he treats about *kneeling* or *ſitting* at the Euchariſt, and concludes that in theſe things no man ought *to obey* till we *can rectifie his judgment.* Now ſuppoſe the Injunctions for kneeling were taken away, are we ſure that all they and we ſhould have ſuch *rectified judgments* on the ſudden, as to agree together about *Receiving*, either *ſitting* or *ſtanding*, or all in any *one poſture ?* Nay, are we not morally certain of the contrary, that there could be no ſuch agreement ? therefore he does well in adjuring us *to admit them in any poſture*, which is *Toleration.* Now conſider, pray, in this one point, what a Confuſion would enſue when in the ſame aſſembly, One might *Receive* the Communion decently *kneeling* : A ſecond (believing that to be Superſtition) demands it *ſitting* : A third (becauſe 'tis reported the *Pope* himſelf ſometimes receives it *ſitting*) judges that (as much better he may) to be *Popery*, therefore he will have it *leaning* or *lying along*, as he thinks the Apoſtles had it. A fourth would be better pleas'd with a *running Banquet*, becauſe the Jews eat the Paſſover in haſte ; and becauſe they have it ſo in ſome places beyond Sea, every one *en Paſſant.* Would not (as St. *Paul* concludes in another caſe) any that ſhould *come into ſuch a Congregation, think they were all mad ?* Oh ! but *if they come in ſincerity*

rity of heart,&c. He may well make an *If* of it. But if they are never ſo ſincere, yet alas! what's their, or our heart in compariſon of Chriſt's heart? and yet he *kneel'd* in ſeveral places, we read, and *lifted up his* Eyes, and *lifted up* his *hands towards Heaven.* And yet 'tis Superſtition in us to kneel at receiving the Body and Blood of Chriſt. But *let us be tender and compaſſionate to our weak Brethren.* If any tender Conſciences, that is (as he explains the word) weak Judgments (and I am not ſo uncharitable as to doubt but there are many ſuch) be ſeriouſly troubled at kneeling, we are heartily troubled too at their Diſcontents. We kneel to God, and pray for their Converſion and Satisfaction. We could even kneel to them that trouble them with vain Scruples, and pray them (with St. *Paul*) to *ſtudy to be quiet.* We readily offer our ſelves either to anſwer their Reaſon (would they bring thoſe could ſpeak it, or rather, write it in ſtrict form of Argument: which yet they would never do, but only make theſe Orations) or elſe if we could not anſwer it, then we would quit our Opinion, and embrace their's. But if they have nothing to oppoſe to us but only this, and if this ſuffices that they are offended at it; at this rate there can be no ſettlement in the World, either of Church or State. For they may deliver themſelves from all its Injunctions, if they pleaſe but to take a Caprice againſt them. This is aſſuming to themſelves a perfect Negative Vote againſt any Law, without giving any reaſon againſt it. If ſuch a Spirit as this be not deſtructive of Chriſtianity, nay, of all Civil Society, and the ready way to ſet the Heels above the Head; we underſtand not any thing.

He huddles up the reſt concerning other Ceremonies, Croſs in Baptiſm, Ring in Marriage, &c. ſlighting them all, and giving them up, without the leaſt ſhadow of an Argument: Except this be one, *Wherefore I conclude* (ſays he) *this point of Ceremonies, with St.* Paul, *He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it,&c. So he that kneeleth, kneeleth unto the Lord, and he that kneeleth not, to the Lord he kneeleth not.* Now do but examine this Concluſion, and whence he draws it.

Consider (pray) that *regarding or not regarding* these *days*, that is the old Jewish *Holy-days* (as presently I shall make it appear) was neither commanded, nor forbidden by the Christian Church, but left indifferent: Is kneeling at the Blessed Sacrament left as indifferent? is it not commanded by the Church? do not they that refuse to kneel disobey the Church? So then his Argument in the Parallel runs thus, *He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it*, &c. So he that kneeleth, kneeleth to the Lord, and he that kneeleth not, to the Lord he kneeleth not; that is, *to the Lord he disobeys the Church, and refuses to kneel.*

But I must needs take notice of his next passage, because 'tis a pleasant one, and because *he desires us to observe* it, how St. *Paul* in this place, *Rom.* 14. *calls the zealous Observer of Ceremonial matters*, the *weak Brother, and commands the strong not to despise him.* So that now the Tables are turn'd, and we of the Church of *England* (our poor weak Mother, as this Author would make her) are the *weak Brethren.* But what (I pray) were those Ceremonies which the Apostle thought it a *weakness* in some to Opiniator? Is it not evident they were the Jewish, out-dated Ceremonies? which the Apostle allowed them to Bury honourably, and therefore was contented they should fall gently, and sink by degrees. Yet he was discontented at their untimely Zeal, that urg'd them still as necessary, and obligatory upon the Christians. He permitted them to have some *regard to a day* (*viz.* an old Jewish Holiday) and if they were over-fond of it, he charged those that better understood their Christianity, to bear with their *weakness.* But if they obstinately persisted to Judaize, as if they were still oblig'd to it, then he tells them, *Galat.* 4. 10. (a place undoubtedly parallel to that urg'd here, *Rom.* 14.) *Ye observe Days, and Months, and Times, and Years, I am afraid of you.* And to assure us he strikes at those who maintain'd the old Mosaick Rites, contrary to the new Christian Ordinances, he, following the same thred of Discourse, enters his Protestation, Chap. 5. v. 2. *Behold, I* Paul *say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ*

Christ shall profit you nothing. *Tertullian*, one of the most Learned Fathers, (whose authority is great, where he reports) descants upon these passages of St. *Paul* smartly, and fully to my purpose. *Then* (says he) *we do Galaticari*, that is, *act like the Galatians indeed, when we observe the Jewish Ceremonies and Legal Solemnities, for if the Apostle intended in this place to take away all devout observance of Days and Months, why* (says he) *do we celebrate Easter every year in the first Month?* (that is, in *March*) *why do we go about and carry with us Joy and Exultation, wherever we come for fifty days after?* 'Tis apparent then, St. *Paul* calls them, and only them, *weak Brethren*, who having embrac't Christianity, yet hanker'd after the Jewish Festivals and their other Ceremonials. Now to say that all Christians, who contend for the keeping of the Festivals, and observing the Ceremonies of the Christian Church, are guilty of Judaizing; and that all such Ceremonies are to be abolisht (all which if it be not said, there can nothing be drawn from St. *Paul* to this Author's purpose) would be spoken almost as senslesly, as was that saying of a certain *weak Brother* indeed, that *Christmass* was *a Jewish Ceremony abolisht at the coming of Christ*. Or to inferr (as this Author is pleas'd to imply) because the Zealous observer of some Ceremonial matters is styl'd by St. *Paul* a *weak Brother*, therefore all Zealous observers of any Ceremonies are *weak Brethren?* 'tis argued much at the same Rate, as another inferr'd, from some other words of St. *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 22. *Ye men of* Athens, I *perceive that ye are in all things too superstitious*. *But* Athens, (said he) *was an University: whence I conclude* (said he) *that all Universities are much given to Superstition*.

What follows to the end of this Chapter, is so thin spread, that I cannot bring it all to make up any thing like one solid Reason; and it seems he is not studying Reason, but *Every man in his humour*, for (he tells us) *Man has a Will as well as a Reason, and will have his own Will in many things: Even the Godly*. So then the Godly *will* have the Ceremonies down, because they are our *Will-worship* (as they use to call it;) But *they will have their own will*, that is, they will set up a certain

Idol, called *Propria voluntas*, or *Self-will-worſhip.*

For the overture he makes us at laſt of a New Sett of better *Ceremonies* one day, if we will part with theſe; though we believe his Intereſt may do much with the *Anti-ceremonian* Party; yet we dare not truſt to that in this affair, becauſe he would have the New Ceremonies to be ſuch as ſhall be *Edifying*, but he does not conſider that ſuch would be *Significant Ceremonies*: which has been the great Objection againſt ours, ever ſince Biſhop *Morton* undertook their defence. So that if any be introduc'd in lieu of theſe, they muſt be *Inſignificant*, that is, Impertinent Ceremonies: Therefore without trying his Experiments, we deſire to retain thoſe we have already.

But with what Forehead does he charge us, in Chriſt's name, with *proceeding ſo ſeverely againſt them in our Courts of Judicature*, p. 20. and with our *violent preſſing of Ceremonies*, p. 21. which he *humbly conceives* hath been *a great hindrance from embracing them*; *Men fearing our Intentions herein to be far worſe* (that is, more Popiſh) *then really they are?* Whereas every body may ſee with half an eye, what *patience* and *gentleneſs* has been exerciſed towards this Party: and how that has emboldened them to ſtand upon ſuch terms, and at ſuch a diſtance as amazes the Proteſtants abroad, thoſe at *Geneva*, and thoſe in *France*: as the Reverend and worthy Dr. *Durell* has made it ſufficiently appear from the *Letters* and *Expreſſes* of his Learned Correſpondents in thoſe parts. In ſhort, if there be no ſuch fears of *Popery* coming in, then has this Author written a dangerous Pamphlet to inſtill into the People ſuch dreadful apprehenſions of it, as of a thing almoſt unavoidable, unleſs this project of his can prevent it; and then there is not that danger which he ſuppoſes, of *preſſing* the Ceremonies, and ſtanding our ground: and if there be juſt fears of *Popery* coming in, then thoſe he Patronizes againſt any *ſevere Proceedings*, are men of exceeding *honeſty* and *prudence* to ſtand out all this while, and venture all, themſelves and all, by not coming into the Church of *England*; and if they have a reſerve to themſelves, that *they will run into it one day*; then is it well or wiſely done of them, to weaken the Fort, by pulling down as much as they can of it,

when

when they mean to enter at last, and trust themselves in it?

But as he is blaming us for being so hard-hearted, and preaching to us not only *Comprehension* but *Toleration*, as I shew'd before, he has one expression towards the end of this Chapter, *p.* 20. so extremely pleasant, that I confess it inclines me after a great deal of dulness to no unpleasant thoughts: That expression of his is this; that *We may break the heart-strings of many in winding them up so high, and thus crack all their Religion: and perhaps we should find it so our selves, had the Non-conformists the screwing* Us *up, as* we *Them.* Why, this of the *Screw* is neater Rhetorick than that of his *nasty Surplices*, or the *Winding-sheet*, or the *Nuts to an Ape*, or that of *knocking Faith into the head with a hammer*, or that of a *King leading on a Morris dance, capering and frisking most featly, when his Country was invaded.* But although this Author declares himself not much a friend to any thing that is Mathematical, yet his choice Metaphor of *Screwing up the Non-conformists* as an Instrument of Musick (as if we meant to make Organs of them) puts me in mind of a rare Engine, an extraordinary kind of Organ, which I have seen described in words at length, and in a Figure too a Brass-cut, in *Gaspar Schottus* the *Jesuite's Mathematicks*, or rather *Mechanical Tricks.* He describes (or rather borrows from *Kircher*, his brother Mountebank, the description of) a "Musical Instrument found out (he tells us) by an Ingenious "fellow, to divert a certain great Prince from a fit of *Me-* "*lancholy.* So he took a company of Cats all of a different "size, and consequently (*saies he*) of a different *Tone* or "*Note:* all these he put together into a kind of Chest that "was fram'd for the purpose, and plac'd them so, that their "Tayls should be gently *screwed* up through certain holes in "a board; and so they should be fastned all along in a row, "and Needles under their Tayls so dispos'd or plac'd, that "as the Musician struck the Keys, the Needles prickt their "Tayls, which so nickt the Cats, when the Organist came "to play a lesson upon them, that still as they were toucht "they set up their *Notes*, some *high*, some *low*, according "to their several Capacities: which made such harmony

Mag. univers. Tom. 2. l. 6. p. 2.

(*saies*

" (*saies he*) as made the *Rats* dance, and the men ready to burst " with laughing.

Just such a *Machine* of a Church would this Author make us, as this Musical Instrument, if instead of our *Screwing up the Non-conformists* (which we do not) or their *Screwing us up* (which once they did sufficiently) he could *screw* them into the Church, without more ado, by this Project of his for *Universal Toleration* (at least of all, or very many Sects, except the *Papists*;) for by what he delivers, not only concerning the *Ceremonies*, but also concerning *Articles of Faith*, we may well conclude, that he would not only have the *Presbyterians* (who seem to stand out only upon Punctilio's of *Ceremonies*) but also *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, and I know not how many more Sects (if they call themselves *Protestants*) taken into the Church: or rather into the *Drag-net* (as Bishop *Laney* calls it in his Sermon about *Comprehension*) large and capacious enough to hold the *Leviathan* himself: whom this Author follows a great way in his Notions of *Sufficient* or *Insufficient Means* for Peoples *Conviction*. And when all such are received into the Church, what will they do but set up their *Cries*, and make their rude Noises in it, if any thing in it afterward happens to pinch them? Then instead of any *Harmony* or *Concord*, I doubt there would be nothing in the Church but such a *Discord*, as would make us only ridiculous to all that come near us.

Animadversions upon his Chapter concerning Church-Service.

HIS next discourse concerning *Church-Service* is all of a piece with the foregoing one about *Ceremonies*; but one comfort is, 'tis not of so great length, and every whit as remarkable for shortness of Reason. Yet here, as he makes his entrance, he is a pretender to Reason; for he slights and passes by some, *with whom he has no Reason to expect that rea-*

reasonable Arguments should prevail. Is he then for Reasonable Arguments? But he should have added this Caution, *Provided they be not deduc'd from Scripture*, for you have seen he thinks it unsafe to make Deductions, that is to *Reason*, from thence. Well, he *Supposes there is nothing in our Common-Prayer-book that is directly contrary to the Word of God* (and I may justly suppose, till the contrary be proved, that there is nothing in it contrary to the Word of God, either *directly* or *indirectly*;) and *p.* 29. He also *Conceives it absolutely necessary to have some Form prescribed to be used by all, &c.* But now, *In Christ* he *humbly beseeches the Governours of the Church calmly to consider, Were it not better to have such a form of Service as would satisfie most?*

It is to be doubted, or rather 'tis out of doubt, that most who are so unsatisfied with this, are disgusted with all Sett Forms, or would not be satisfied with any other. Therefore we must be excus'd from trying his trick, till he or some other Undertaker have corrected *Magnificat*, and the *People*, the People (whom he would have so caress'd) have declared themselves satisfied with it, or else have subscribed a Blank, to be satisfied with whatever the New Projectors shall introduce.

His next Pique is at *our saying the Second Service at the Altar, which* (he saies) *was retain'd by the Fathers, and first Reformers from* Popery, *as carrying some resemblance with the* Mass, *the Peoples delight, which being now become the Peoples hate, should for the same Resemblance by the same Reason be taken away.*

For our Reading the Second Service at the Altar, any one that can but read, and is not a mere stranger in the Old *Liturgicks*, knows that the Prayers were at the Altar, many whole Ages before *Popery*, either Name or Thing was heard of. Therefore, unless this Author knew the Reformers thoughts, he can have no reason to put it upon them (not at all for their honour, though he would fain have it so) that they prescribed this as *carrying some resemblance to the* Mass, *the peoples delight.* Why should he dream they did it to follow the Multitude in the Novelties of Popery, and not rather to follow the Primitive Church?

Church? I ſuppoſe the Reformers meaning in preſcribing the Prieſt's going up to the Altar ſtill, was to declare and teſtifie to the Chriſtian World, that the Church of *England* highly approves *Communion* upon all High Daies, as the Chriſtian Sacrifice of *Commemoration*, and the moſt Sacred Office in our Publick Worſhip: and as it was conſtantly uſed in the Ancient Church upon every Lord's Day, and every Solemn Feſtival. They would no longer allow the Prieſt to receive the Sacrament alone, becauſe there was no ground either in the Scripture or the Fathers for ſuch a *Solitary Communion*. The very terms ſound like a Contradiction: But for all that, the Reformers from *Popery* kept up the Communion Service at the *Communion Table*, and ſo the *Rubrick* orders it ſtill, where the Place will bear it (for it muſt be confeſs'd, many of our Pariſh Churches are ſo built, that the *Second Service* cannot be audibly read from the Eaſt-end: But where it can, there it ought to be) for a very ſufficient reaſon, that the *memory* at leaſt of Weekly (if not Daily) Sacraments might not be loſt: and that, if the Peoples *Devotion* could be raiſed again, which the *Monkery* of thoſe times had turned into the Formality of Communicating *once a year* (as the *Roman* Church requires no more of *Lay perſons*) then the Prieſt ſhould be in his ſtation to ſhew himſelf ready to Adminiſter, not only *thrice a year* (which is all our Church has thought fit to exact hitherto) but *every Sunday* and *Holy-day*. It were better then that we fell to our prayers and endeavours, that *the People may be ſo well fitted and prepared to Receive, as the Primitive frequency of* Sacraments *may be reſtor'd*, than to ſit and make wiſhes, that *Reading the Second Service at the Altar may be taken away.*

How conſiſtent he is with himſelf in that which follows in the ſame page, requiring *Uniformity* and *Conformity* after ſuch and ſuch Amendments, I have already diſcourſed, and ſhew'd it unpracticable even upon his own Principles. As for his varying the Phraſe, and ſaying that again *p.* 24. which he had ſaid over and over, that *Certainly his Religion is vain, that would abandon the ſubſtance for want of the Ceremonies*; which he acknowledges

acknowledges to be *no way neceſſary*; I anſwer, that certainly his *Religion* is as *vain*, if not vainer, that would abandon the *Subſtance* (as they do that are guilty of *Schiſm*) for the *Ceremonies*, which he muſt acknowledge to be no way *Unlawful*.

But his next Figure is a rare one. *Surely a very uncharitable mind that would not leave ninety and nine unneceſſary Ceremonies, to bring one ſinful ſtray'd Sheep into the Congregation.* An admirable Metamorphoſis! *Ninety Sheep* in the Text, turn'd into *Ceremonies* by this Commentator. And would the Author of *Naked Truth* have all theſe poor Innocent Lambs, otherwiſe call'd *Ceremonies* to be left *naked* and *ſhivering* in the Wilderneſs? But (as one reply'd upon the like Expoſition of another Text, *Nonne ſunt decem Mundi?* Engliſh'd by one, *Are there not ten Worlds?*) *Sed ubi ſunt Novem? Where are the Nine?* much leſs *Ninety nine* Ceremonies. Sure he muſt take in all the Ceremonies at *Court*, and the *Inns of Court*, the Serjeants *Coifes*, and their Mens *party-colour'd Coats*, and all our *Univerſity Ceremonies*; (for we ſhall ſee anon, he is no great admirer of *Univerſities*;) all theſe put together will hardly make up *Ninety nine* Ceremonies, though we take in the Batchelor's *Hoods* and *Lambskins*: and why muſt theſe be expoſed to be devoured by *Wolves*? And yet we will go as far as he to bring one ſinful *ſtray'd Sheep* into the Congregation, and *convert him from the error of his* Non-conforming *waies*; and therefore he does ill to reflect upon us thus, *Yet theſe men will moſt paſſionately* (and pardon me if I ſay, *moſt uncharitably* and *irreligiouſly*) *cry, Away with theſe* Idiot-Sectaries *and* Phanaticks: *let them wander and periſh in their own wild Imagination: We will not leave one Ceremony, nor any one line of our Common prayer-book to gain Thouſands of them. No, if you alter that, we will rather leave the Church and go the Papiſts Maſs.* Whoſe words are theſe, but his own? Which of us ever ſaid ſo? therefore to retort him part of his own Cenſure, this is ſaid *Paſſionately*, I will not ſay, as he ſpeaks, *Uncharitably* and *Irreligiouſly*.

After he has Complemented both Parties, calling us, *too*

zealous Ceremoniſts; Them, *blind and wilful Separatiſts*; He takes his leave: aſſuring us, that *after our charitable Condeſcention, their Populous* (I ſuppoſe he means *Popular*) *pretences will be ſo confuted, their mouths ſo ſtopt* (or *open'd* to ask the more, but that's all one;) *as for mere* Shame, *if not for* Reaſon *or* Religion, *they muſt come into the Church: and their Paſtors coming in, the Sheep will follow.* (Alas! it is rather the cuſtom of theſe Shepherds to follow the Sheep, whatever Toy they take.) *So the Shop-prating* Weavers *will ſoon be deſerted, ſeeing their own Naked Folly*; (ſomewhat akin to this Author's *NAKED TRUTH*).

Animadverſions upon his Chapters concerning Preaching, Confirmation, *and* Church-Government.

I Knew a Scholar, a man of Wit, but no very hard Student, that quickly after the Church was reſtor'd, would needs become an Author upon this Subject, *How neceſſary all the parts of* Univerſity Learning *are for a Divine.* One of his Books he preſented to an Eminent Perſon, who told him pleaſantly, that *he was extreme happy in the choice of his Subject, for he could not fail to demonſtrate effectually, whether he writ upon it* Learnedly *or* Unlearnedly, *what need a Divine had of Univerſity Learning.* Our Author in his Chapter upon *Preaching* has very ſufficiently prov'd the ſame thing, even where he makes it his buſineſs to prove the contrary. Little did we think at this time of day to hear of a Second part of Mr. *Dell* againſt *Univerſities.* The two Authors have many Expreſſions in them ſo exactly parallel (if it were worth our while to ſet them in two Columns, over-right one another) one would ſuſpect the *Junior* of the two for a Plagiary.

Yet have I no quarrel to him for his blaming that way of *Preach-*

Preaching, upon this or that *nice Speculation*, or that way of keeping alwaies in *Universals*, and never coming to *Particulars*, the *Duty between Man and Wife, Parents and Children, &c.* or that way of *Dividing and Subdividing into Generals and Particulars*, the *Quid*, the *Quale*, the *Quantum*; though he will find, if he looks abroad, that this is at a very low ebb, and the Tide runs now another and a better way. We care as little as he for *a witty Rhetorical Harangue*, or a *cunning Syllogistical discourse* in the Pulpit: and 'tis almost as ill a Character as can be given of a Sermon, or a Catechizing, to be *ridiculously Learned*: yet to talk, as this Author does, as if *University-Learning* were *unnecessary* to a Preacher, is to be *ridiculously Ignorant* of the *use*, or rather the *necessity* of it as matters stand. He *beseeches* us *to tell him, Did not Christ and his Apostles preach the best way? and are not we to follow their example?* And I beseech him to tell me, Do not many good Divines preach the same way, as far as it ought to be followed by those that only sit at the Apostles feet? that is, Do they not with all plainness prove from Scripture all that they deliver as *God's Word?* This is our *Unapostolick way of Preaching* (as he calls it) *the vain unedifying practice we now are in.* Indeed we have no *Miracles* at command to prove what we say (as the *Apostles* had) and therefore must do it by *Reason*, which serves us to prove the Apostles did such Miracles: and that again rationally demonstrates the *Scriptures* to be *God's Word*: and then by the *Testimony of the Church* in several Ages (besides the understanding we must have of all the *Internal Arguments* for it;) we must be able to shew that these are the *Books of Scripture*: and after all this, the same *Reason* must be employed to establish the true sense and meaning of them. In order to these great Ends, *Reason* must be improved by the studying of *Arts, Sciences*, and *Languages*; unless we had all these infus'd as we needed them, we must *acquire* them. Therefore his Argument is so far from holding good, *God thought the gift of Tongues needless after the Gospel was once spread over the World: I pray let us be no wiser than God and his Christ*; that is, *Let us think the study of the Languages needless*: (for that he means, or nothing:)

Yea, rather the ſtudy of Tongues is therefore *neceſſary* becauſe the *Gift is ceaſt*, and they cannot be had without ſtudy: For the *certainty* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, and the *verity* of the *Original Scriptures* cannot be defended without a good meaſure of skill in the *Languages*, *Arts* and *Sciences*, which every one that is not unworthy to wear the Name of a Divine, ſhould be competently able to do. Thus much the Apoſtle St. *Peter* (1 *Pet.* 3. 15.) requires, even of the Laity in their degree, that they *be ready alwaies to give an Anſwer to every man that asketh them a reaſon of the Hope that is in them.* Now (to ſum up the Argument) where is it almoſt poſſible for theſe Acquiſitions to be made, except in *Univerſities?* Therefore we are ſtill in that vulgar Error which he taxes as the *General Opinion*, p. 27. *that* (except ſome very few extraordinary Inſtances to the contrary) *none are fit to be admitted into Holy Orders, but ſuch as have ſtudied in the Univerſity.*

But I beſeech you (ſaies he in the ſame page) *what have theſe Sciences* (*falſly ſo call'd*) *to do with the Goſpel?* and he inſtances preſently in the *Mathematicks* as a *Science* (it ſeems) *falſly ſo called.* His quarrel at the *Jeſuites* in *China*, I muſt needs ſay, is an idle one, for recommending themſelves to the King and his Courtiers by the Skill ſome of the Society, *whom they ſent for*, had in the *Mathematicks*: Whereas their Errand thither was to *preach the Goſpel.* What of all that? are theſe ſo *Heathen Studies*, that they are not to be tolerated even then, when they help to introduce *Chriſtianity*? But he ſeems to have the ſame compaſs of underſtanding in theſe Arts and Sciences) (*falſly ſo call'd* you muſt think) that a certain old *Head* of a *Houſe* had, who coming one day by chance into the *Colledge-Library*, and finding there an ingenious young man reading *Chriſtoph. Clavius* (the Jeſuite) upon *Euclid*, *Now a ſhame take thee* (ſaid he) *why doſt thou not get thee ſome Proteſtant Mathematicks?*

But ſince his greateſt Pique is at *Logick*, and he can never leave inveighing againſt *Syllogiſms* and *Human Deductions*, and ſtill he is raiting off his Preachers from *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Euclid*, *Scotus*, *Aquinas* (ſo he puts them together, *p.* 28. very Chronologi-

nologically) and then very Logically contradiſtinguiſhes *Mathematicks*, *Logick*, *Phyſick* (whether *Medicine* or *Natural Philoſophy*) to *Gravity*, *Sobriety*, *Meekneſs*, *Diligence*, *and the like*. I ſhould not ſufficiently acquit my ſelf in the Defence of Univerſities (which I have undertaken, for the Church of *England* no where looks more hopefully than in the Univerſities) where the faculty of *diſputing* is ſo well taught, as it can hardly be learnt any where elſe, if I ſhould not vindicate this Faculty from being that, with *which* (he ſays *p.* 15.) *God will not endure to be fetter'd, as with Philoſophical Sophiſms and Human Conſequences, but beyond his promiſe* (I ſuppoſe the very words of any Promiſe, as he explains himſelf, *ipſiſſimis verbis*) *he is not ſure of any thing, though it ſeems ever ſo rational.* It were in vain to produce St. *Auguſtine*'s Teſtimony (*l. de Ordine c.* 17.) where he praiſes *Logick*, for he was one of the *Fathers* who by this very means *defaced and ſpoiled Chriſtianity*. And I know not whether Biſhop *Davenant* have any better Credit with him, who in his Learned Commentary on the *Coloſſians*, Chap. 2. falls into the ſame Hereſie, and beſtows great Commendations on that Noble Art or Science. Perhaps it will be to no purpoſe to put him in mind that our Bleſſed Saviour was pleas'd to be a kind of *Quæſtioniſt* (as our Univerſity Statutes call young *Logicians*) when he *diſputed with the Doctors*, being himſelf but twelve years of age. And if I ſhould tell him of St. *Stephen*'s *diſputing with certain of the Synagogue of the Libertines*, who *were not able to reſiſt the Wiſdom*, as well as *the Spirit by which he ſpake*. Or if I ſhould urge the Example of *Apollos an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures*, as well as *fervent in ſpirit, who mightily convinc't the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was Chriſt*: that is (no doubt) *by deductions from Scripture*; Perhaps he would phancy ſtill that they us'd ſome other *Logick* than what we ſtudy at Univerſities, for which we are ſo much beholding to ſome Heathen Philoſophers, as if it were for the Honour of Chriſtian Religion, to have a *Logick* made on purpoſe to juſtifie its Doctrines, and as if it were not much more for its Honour to be able to maintain thoſe Doctrines by the ſame ſtanding Rules which all the World, even the Heathen World, found

out

out and eſtabliſht, as immediately founded upon Natural Reaſon. I will therefore ſhew him that Chriſt and his Apoſtles did many times Argue explicitly in *Mood* and *Figure*: and ſometimes only ſo implicitly, that Men may be damn'd for not making ſuch *Deductions* as they ought to make from Scripture. As in St. *John* 8.47. our Saviour tells the Multitude, *He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, becauſe ye are not of God.* 'Tis a Syllogiſm in the fourth *Mood* of the ſecond *Figure*, and runs thus:

Whoſoever is of God hears God's words:
But ye do not hear God's words;
Therefore ye are not of God.

St. *Paul, Heb.* 12.7,8. Argues in the ſame *Mood* and *Figure.*

Every Son is chaſtned by the Father:
But ye are not chaſtned by the Father; (on ſuppoſition that they would not endure to be ſo)
Therefore ye are not Sons: that is, *ye are Baſtards.*

In the 22*th* of St. *Matthew*, Chriſt in his Diſpute with the *Sadduces* calls that *Siripture*, which was only *a Rational deduction* from Scripture: and they are pronounc't by our Saviour to *err* and *not* to *know the Scriptures*, which did not know how to collect a true *Inference* from Scripture, though they knew the *Words* well enough. And yet our Saviour's Argument cannot be explicated without two or three *Syllogiſms*, which may be theſe.

1. *God is the God of the Living*:
God is the God of Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob;
Therefore Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob *live.*

2. *They that live not now in their Perſons, but live unto God, muſt be raiſed from the Dead*:
But they (*viz.* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob) *that live unto*

unto God, live not now in their Perſons;
Therefore they (*viz.* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob) *muſt be raiſed from the Dead.*

3. *They that now live only in their Souls, live not now in their Perſons:*
But they (*viz.* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob) *now live only in their Souls;*
Therefore they (*viz.* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob) *live not now in their Perſons.*

Now what if the propoſitions of ſuch a *Syllogiſme* happen to be disjoyn'd in the Scripture being about the ſame matter? is it not lawful and ſafe to put them both together, and make the *Deduction?* For Example, a great Divine (who is now a Reverend Prelate, the preſent Lord Biſhop of *Ely*) was arguing with a *Perſon of Honour* and Learning of the *Romiſh Perſwaſion*, againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*; and in that Diſcourſe the Doctor ask't him, *If the Subſtance of the Bread and Wine remain'd no longer, but was done away, then what did the wicked eat and drink, that eat and drank unworthily?* nothing but *Accidents?* The Nobleman anſwer'd, *That they eat the Body, and drank the Blood of Chriſt.* Whereupon the Doctor urg'd him with this *Syllogiſme*:

Whoſoever eats the Fleſh of Chriſt and drinks his Blood hath eternal life, abiding in him, Joh. 6. 54. & 56.
But no Murderer hath eternal life abiding in him, 1 *Joh.* 3. 15.
Therefore no murderer eats the Fleſh of Chriſt, and drinks his Blood.

The *Major Propoſition* is Chriſt's own words; the *Minor* is the Apoſtle St. *John*'s words; the *Syllogiſm* is true *in the form*, as well as *in the matter*; therefore the *Concluſion* is firm and certain. But that Honourable Perſon ſmil'd, and ask't the Doctor (in this Author's way) *Whether he would have him*

him build his Faith upon Syllogiſms? As if a true *Syllogiſm*, both for *matter* and *form*, were any thing elſe but *true Reaſon*: And as if any part of our Faith were (not only above our Reaſon, but) unanſwerably contradictory to Reaſon, and to the rules of Reaſoning. Sure if the Apoſtle prays for a Deliverance *from unreaſonable men, for ſome men have not Faith*; implying that ſuch men as have not *Faith* are *unreaſonable* in that, (however rational they be in other affairs); Then we may ſafely and truly convert the ſenſe of that *Propoſition*, and conclude, this or that (as *Tranſubſtantiation* in the Caſe before us) is indeed *unreaſonable*, therefore it ought to be no part of any man's *Faith*.

A thouſand more ſuch Inſtances may be raiſed out of other Texts, but theſe may ſuffice. This is that which St. *Paul* calls ἐλέγχειν ἀντιλέγοντας, to *convince Gainſayers*, the very *word* of *Ariſtotle*, which is honour enough for that Philoſopher.

If he had *his wiſh* (which is ours as well as his) *that only grave, diſcreet, and conſcientious Perſons were put into the Miniſtry*: then he foreſees, and foretells that *many Perſons of good rank and eſtate, would think it no diſhonour, but rather an high honour to enter into it, as they did in the Primitive Times.* Though we cannot ſhew ſo many Heroick Examples of this kind as were in thoſe bleſſed times, yet, thanks be to God, *many perſons of good rank and eſtate* do *think it no diſhonour* to be Clergy-men: and perhaps there were never ſo many *well-born men* in the Church ſince the Reformation, though he takes no notice of it, but rather implies the contrary, that men of Quality count it a diſparagement to be in *Holy Orders*. He might conſider that two of our greateſt *Prelates* are Sons to *Peers* of the *Realm*, and that my Lord's Grace of *Canterbury*, my L. Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, and my L. Biſhop of *Hereford* (beſides ſeveral other Biſhops) are Gentlemen of ancient *Families*, and Honourable *Names* in this Kingdom: and always muſt be. Of ſuch as theſe, the Prefacer to Mr. *Herbert's Country Parſon* ſpeaks thus, with holy and lofty Eloquence; "Theſe Noble Perſons ſo excellently "qualified with Vertues, Learning, and Piety, by bringing along "with them into the Church, the Eminency of their Birth alſo, "have caſt a luſtre upon the Clergy, as greater Starrs help to brighten

"brighten up their leſs ſhining Neighbours: and have advanc't "their Chriſtian Prieſthood to the height it was at, under the "*Law of Nature*, when it was the hereditary Honour and "Prerogative of the *Firſt-born*, or *chief* of the Family, to be "the *Prieſt of the moſt High God.*

But *whether Univerſity men or not it matters not, ſo as fully inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Goſpel by ſound Commentators.* And, why *matters it not?* Where are they like to be *ſo fully inſtructed in the Doctrine of the Goſpel?* or even in *ſound Commentators* (if they are all in all with him) as in Univerſities? But, I ſuppoſe, he means ſome *Engliſh* Commentators, ſuch as the *Aſſemblies Notes*: for Dr. *Hammonds* will miſlead them concerning *Epiſcopacy.* For ſuch as were never *Academians*, the *Latin* they bring from School, together with ſome *Hebrew*, and little or no *Greek*, will hardly carry them farther, except into ſome renowned *Poſtillers.* Yet theſe are the men whom he would ſet up to Preach, with that which he calls the *Demonſtration of the Spirit.* By which I cannot gather what he *means* from all that he *ſpeaks*, unleſs it be to *ſpeak* (as he does) *Magiſterialy:* But that that is not to ſpeak with *Demonſtration of the Spirit*, I refer him to the firſt part of the *Friendly Debate*, where that is clear'd ſufficiently.

But, to return to the point we were upon, the *Intereſt of Univerſities*, Would he have Men of Quality come into the Church, and not be capable of its higheſt Dignities? And would not this be a rare Breeding for ſuch as ſhould be deſign'd for our greateſt *Dignitaries* and *Prælates*, never to come near either of the *Univerſities*, but to live in the Country poring upon his *Commentators?* A good way indeed to make them *Gentle-Readers*; as he tells us, *Julian the Emperour's Kinſman, and afterwards Emperour himſelf, was admitted a Reader in the Church:* or for a need, to make them ſuch *Lecturers* as he is forming in this Chapter: or ſuch, as one verily thought King *Henry the Eighth* had been, when reading his Life as it is written by my Lord *Herbert* of *Cherbury*; inſtead of the words of the Noble Hiſtorian, which are theſe (p. 2.) *His Education was accurate, being deſtined*

† Concil. Trid. l. 1. (as a Credible Author affirms †) *to the Arch-bishoprick of* Canterbury, *during the life of his elder Brother Prince* Arthur, he mistook and read it, *His Education was a Curate, being destin'd to the Arch bishoprick of* Canterbury.

For *Confirmation*, he is in the right where he urges the Necessity of it: And perhaps not much in the wrong, where he proposes an Expedient for *the Bishop to appoint some discreet Conscientious Ministers (as our Deans Rural should be) in several Circuits to examine.* Though 'tis a little hard that he will not trust every Parish-Priest with Examining, præparatory to Confirmation, when he makes them one and the same Order with the Bishops themselves. But whereas he adds, to *Examine and Licence to the Lord's Table*; (*for I pass it as granted, that* Confirmation *is no Sacrament*;) so do I take it for granted, that 'tis *not only a License to the Lord's Table*, and to think it is only so, is to run into one extreme of speaking too *meanly* of it to avoid the other of such as call it a *proper Sacrament.* For by his favour, our Youth may receive the Sacrament before they are Confirmed. To what purpose then does he put the case so tragically against the Bishops? *It may often happen* (saies he) *that a pious Child, well fitted for the Holy Sacrament, and perchance being weak, earnestly desires it before his death, yet must stay some years till next* Visitation, *or take a long journey to the Bishop, for which he may want strength or means to support him.* No, his pious Child need not stay some years, nor yet some hours for the Sacrament, nor travel any farther than the *Rubrick* (which one would think this Author never saw;) the words of which are these, *And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be Confirm'd, or be ready and desirous to be Confirm'd.*

It is indeed *not possible for a Bishop in a large Diocess and Triennial Visitation to perform this Necessary work as it ought*, if there have not been good Catechizing and prævious Examinations: but (supposing those) *Why may not Priests, not Bishops, perform it?* And why must Confirmation be taken out of the Bishop's hands upon this wild account? When St. *Philip* had converted *Samaria*, *Act.* 8. 15. whilst the Apostles were at *Jerusalem*,

ruſalem, can we think, when ſome of them came thither, that they Perſonally examin'd *all the People* in that place, who *with one accord gave heed unto thoſe things which* Philip *ſpake?* And yet *they laid their hands on them*, being I preſume well ſatisfied with *Philip*'s account of them, and *they received the Holy Ghoſt.* For *Philip*'s Examination of them was in order to Baptiſm, and after that it was uſual to adminiſter *Confirmation*, and the Euchariſt alſo to Adults at the ſame time.

For his Exception at *Baptizing, tolerated in Neceſſity to Midwives*; and he *would gladly ſee any ſuch thing in Antiquity. Tolerated by whom? by the Church?* Pray let him look upon the *Rubrick* concerning *Private Baptiſm* before he writes again, where the words are theſe, *Firſt let the Miniſter of the Pariſh, or in his abſence, any other lawful Miniſter that can be procured, with them that are preſent call upon God.* Yet were *Tertullian* now alive, who knew the Cuſtomes of the Ancient Church as well, I ſuppoſe, as this Author; he would not have cenſur'd our Church for *Tolerating* ſo much in that point: For ſure he goes much farther, aud will ſhew him ſomewhat more than this *in Antiquity*, in caſe of *Neceſſity* (ſnch a Neceſſity they did believe of Baptiſm) his known words are theſe, that in ſuch a caſe, *Quilibet Laicus tingit.* And I know not in this caſe, and according to this Author's Principles, what a Lay-man can do more than a Woman.

For the great things he ſpeaks of the *Power* of the *Keys* in his Chapter of *Church-Government*, they are well and truly ſpoken: but ſo is not that which follows, *Yet this is in a manner quite relinquiſht to Chancellors, Lay-men, &c.* The Church perhaps was never happier ſince the *Reformation* in men of this Profeſſion, that fill up thoſe places with great Ability and Integrity, and I add, with great deference to their Superiours the Biſhops. No doubt they are moſt capable to examine and declare upon matter of Fact, whether or no this or that perſon have done the fact, to which the Canon has decreed *Excommunication*: but they underſtand too well to think they have the *Power* of the *Keys*, wherefore the Sentence (where things are regularly done) is pronounc'd by a Prieſt, not by a Lay-Chancellour.

lour. And his Similitude of the Parish-Clark *jingling the Keys* when the Rector has lockt any one out of the Church, to which he likens those proceedings in the *Spiritual Court*, is a *Jingle* it self and no better. *You will answer me* (saies he) *The Bishops themselves pass it over, &c. Truly in this you have reason, and the blame must wholly light on them.* No, I will not answer him so, but I will ask him one plain Question: Are the Bishops wholly to blame, that the *Canons* of 1640 are not observed, which make abundant provision against such Abuses? or rather, Are not those to blame who explode these *Canons?*

He tells us, that *in the times of Popery, when Spiritual and Temporal affairs were all intermingled and horribly confounded, the* Bishops *were frequently Lord-Keepers, Treasurers, Chief-Justices, Vice-Roys: and what not? which is strangely Unapostolical and unlawful.* No men were greater Blessings to their times, even in those times of Popery when they sat at the Helm, than the Bishops. 'Twas Bishop *Morton*'s Industrious brain that made up the Fatal breach, and United the two Houses of *York* and *Lancaster*, in the happy marriage between King *Henry the Seventh* and the Lady *Elizabeth*; and it was under the Ministry of Bishop *Fox*, who was Lord Privy-Seal, and by his reaching Parts, that the grounds were laid for a more happy Union between the two Kingdoms of *England* and *Scotland* in that Marriage, which was design'd with a deep and long train of memorable Policies, that the eldest Daughter of *Henry* should marry *James* of *Scotland*, and the younger should match into *France*, that so if ever they should come to inherit, *Scotland* might be the *Annexe* to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, and that *England* might never be in the nature of a Province to *France*. In the Old Testament there are Examples enow of *Priests* that were Ministers of State; those I confess were Unapostolical, that is, long before the Apostles, but he will have much adoe to prove them *unlawful*. He might have omitted Lord-keepers and Treasurers for Bishop *Williams* and Bishop *Juxon*'s sake: one of them as able in the Chancery as the other in the Treasury. And whereas the King is graciously pleased at this time to bestow the great Seal of *Ireland* upon a Reverend

verend Prælate there, I hope this Author will not deny, but his Majesty has put him into a lawful Calling.

But whereas in the end of this Chapter he justly complains of *exempt Jurisdictions* as *meerly Papal*, and *a thing altogether unknown to Antiquity* (wherein he is much in the right) I wonder he does not discern his own Scheme *concerning Bishops and Priests* to be *Papal* too, and that *Presbyterianism* has no pretence to Antiquity, but what it has from *Popery*. It was Pope *Innocent* the 4*th*. (whom for such pranks as these his Party celebrate for a *most wise Pope*) who decreed, that *ex dispensatione & deputatione solius Pontificis Romani*, one Priest might ordain another: whosoever then writes the History of *Presbytery* should make it begin from *Rome*, and not take its rise from *Geneva*; who does not know that the Popish Schoolmen and Canonists have made it their business to degrade their Bishops, and confound them into one and the same order with the Presbyters? to exempt the Regular Clergy from Episcopal Jurisdiction, and as many of the Secular as they please? who made the Cardinals, that were but mere parish-Priests, and many of them no Bishops to this day, superiors to all the Bishops, nay, Governers and Judges over all Prelates in the vacancy of the Popedom? The *Consistory of Cardinals* is then their only *head* of the Catholick Church upon earth, which is all one as if it were *headed* with a *Geneva-Consistory*; both Papists and Presbyterians take down the *Superior order* and advance the *middle*, only Mr. *Calvin* and his Followers will have all this depend immediately on *Christ himself*, whereas the Romish Party makes it depend immediately on one they call *Christ's Vicar*: For how vehemently did the Papalins, even in their Council of *Trent*, urge and press it, *That the Power and Jurisdiction was wholly given to the Bishop of* Rome? and *that every particular Bishop being only* de Jure Canonico, *may be removed by the Pope's Authority?* he that would see more to the same purpose, let him consult the Cardinal *Pallavicino* (if he will not trust *Padre Paolo*) where he may read the long Speech of Father *Laynez*, all to this effect. But though I had prepared some Animadversions upon this Chapter too *concerning Bishops and Priests*, yet it has been so learnedly confuted in a Sermon preached at *Whitehall*, which I hear is to be published by His Majesties special Command, that I shall not need, nor presume to touch that Chapter. *Ani-*

Animadverſions on his Charitable Admoniti-on *to all Non-conformiſts.*

I Find little to complain of in his *Charitable Admonition*, but that it is no longer: *O ſi ſic omnia dixiſſet!* In the Cloſe he beſpeaks them at this rate; and I will do him the courteſie to tranſcribe a great deal in his own words, that ſo they may be reprinted with a Licenſe, though they were printed without one.

I beſeech you (ſaies he) *to conſider the great miſchief you bring upon this Church and Nation by your Separation from the Church; you pretend to be the great Zealots againſt Popery, and yet give me leave to ſay, your indiſcreet diſobedient Zeal mainly brings it in; your ſeparation, and many following diviſions, have cauſed many to abhor our Church and turn to Popery, and doubtleſs you are to give an account to God for the ruine of thoſe Souls; for I can never yield that you have any reaſonable and true conſcientious cauſe of Separation, but merely miſtaken Reaſon and Conſcience, which I much pity, but no way approve; and therefore I muſt lay the advance of Popery to your charge, to your Separation, for I am ſure 'tis the main Snare wherewith they catch unſtable Souls, perſwading them our Church is not guided by the Spirit of Truth, ſeeing it is ſo confounded by the Spirit of Diviſion, it cannot be of God, who is both* Verity *and* Unity. *Now, though it be well known to the Learned, that their Church hath neither Verity nor Unity, yet this is not ſo diſcernible to weak Souls, &c.*

'Tis true indeed, after great *Searchings of heart* occaſioned by our *Diviſions*, many ſet up their reſt upon Popery: though the Principles upon which the Church of *Rome* pretends to judge o Controverſies do claſh and fight even with one another, and therefore are moſt unfit to quiet other mens thoughts, yet becauſe that Church is a Great Promiſer, they take *Sanctuary* there, reſolving as *Joab* did, that if they *Periſh*, it ſhall be at *the Horns of the Altar*. But I would fain know of this Author, if our *Diviſions* fright ſo many from our Church, then would not ſtreightning the Terms of our Belief, as in his Chapter *concerning Articles of Faith*, and *aboliſhing all our Ceremonies*, and *blending our Orders*, be the cauſe of more *Diviſions*, and conſequently of more Separati-

ons

ons from the Church of *England?* Would not this give the higheſt advantage to the *Romiſh* Party? And would not they be ſure to urge it upon their coming Proſelytes, that we had abandon'd our former Principles? That we had receded from our own Articles, by which we gave ſo good an account of our ſelves to the whole Chriſtian World at the Reformation? That we had baniſht not only all exterior Beauty, but *Order* and *Decency* out of our *Publick Worſhip?* That we had been falſe to God, and to the Church of God, in breaking ſo many Proteſtations as we had made heretofore againſt ſuch proceedings as theſe, and conſequently falſe (as all Cowards are) to our ſelves? Therefore whilſt he has ſo much Charity for ſome that *will have their own will* (as he tells us) he muſt be intreated to have a little Charity too for our Underſtanding; and not to expect we ſhould give away our Religion in a fit of Complaiſance, and throw our Church out at window in a frolick. His greateſt Argument why all this ought to be yielded, is grounded only upon Policy. And perhaps he is as much miſtaken in his Policy, as in his Divinity. They are not born to be any Repairers of our breaches, that are the Authors of ſuch raſh Counſels as theſe, which are worſe than thoſe *Dolabella* gave *Cicero* his Father-in-law, when the Commonwealth was in a manner loſt, *Reliquum eſt, ubi nunc eſt Reſpublica ibi ſimus, potius quàm dum illam veterem ſequimur, ſimus in nullâ:* But this Author would not have us take things as we find them, but make them worſe, becauſe they are no better. Thus, "What the *Romans* ſcorned "to do after the battel of *Cannæ*, What the *Venetians* never did, "when they had loſt all their *Terra firma;* That Men are Now "taught to think a Vertue, and the ſign of a Wiſe and good man, "*Deſperare de Republicâ.* They are the words of the *Chriſtian Cicero* (as I preſume to ſtyle him) the preſent Lord Chancellour in his Speech to both Houſes of Parliament, *April* 13*th.* 1675. And ſince I am fallen by chance into the *Roman* Hiſtory, I will conclude with a remarkable paſſage out of *Livy* (lib. 5.) When the *Gauls* a Barbarous People had ſackt the City of *Rome*, and cut the *Senators* Throats as they ſat in the Streets, and when afterwards *Camillus* a Baniſht man, had driven them away, and reſtored the Common-wealth; yet the People ſeeing the City ſo defac'd

and

and ſpoiled, were importunate to remove the Imperial Seat from *Rome* and ſettle at *Veii*; whilſt the Senate were debating it very warmly, and rather inclining to remove; as the Regiment that had the Guard that day paſs'd through the *Forum*, the *Centurion* that Commanded gave Orders aloud, ſo that the *Senate* over-heard him into the Senate-Houſe, *Signifer ſtatue Signum: Sta miles: hic optimè manebimus. Enſign ſet down the Colours; Souldiers ſtand; this is the beſt place for us to make our Station.* Whereupon the *Senate* took the Omen, roſe immediately from their Conſultation; and all the People approv'd their Generous Reſolution. There is a Thundring Legion of thoſe that are at their prayers and tears, and who keep as it were God-Almighty's Watch for the preſervation of the moſt Apoſtolical Church in the World: And as a Holy Biſhop bid *Monica* the Mother of St. *Auguſtine*, before he was any Saint, *go away and be comforted, for it was impoſſible the Son of ſo many tears as He had coſt her ſhould periſh*; (And this, ſaies that good Father, was received as *a Voice from heaven.*) So I hope the *Mother*, over whom ſo many of her own *Sons* are weeping, and as it were, wreſtling with God in ſecret, can never miſcarry. But if the Queſtion be now, whither we ſhall remove the Ancient Land-marks, and carry our Church either toward *Rome*, or *Geneva*; the miraculous Providence of God in reſtoring it together with his Majeſty, after ſo many years Baniſhment, and ever ſince preſerving it, may, as a voice from Heaven, animate us to reſolve, that *this is the beſt place where we are fixt, and here may we keep our ſtation.*

FINIS.